DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 364 041 EC 302 611

AUTHOR York, Jennifer; And Others
TITLE Regular Class Integration of Middle School Students with Severe Disabilities: Feedback from Teachers and Classmates. Project Report Number 89-5.
INSTITUTION Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. Inst. on Community Integration.
SPONS AGENCY Minnesota State Dept. of Education, St. Paul.; Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 89
CONTRACT 37010-57613; G008630347-88
NOTE 93p.; Cover title varies.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute on Community Integration, Publications Office, 109 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Dr., S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55455.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Interpersonal Competence; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; *Mainstreaming; Middle Schools; *Outcomes of Education; Peer Acceptance; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Severe Disabilities; *Social Integration; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Middle School Students

ABSTRACT

Regular educators (n=11), special educators (n=7), and classmates without disabilities (n=181) were surveyed at the end of the first year that middle school students with severe disabilities were integrated into regular education classes in two suburban midwestern communities. Results revealed many benefits for educators and students. Educators and classmates concurred that positive outcomes, particularly in the area of social competence, were realized by the students with severe disabilities. Acceptance of students with severe disabilities by classmates was considered to have increased substantially. Educators felt the regular class integration experiences were positive for themselves and for students, although there were differences in perspective between regular and special educators. Both groups felt that the best aspect of the integration initiative was the acceptance by and involvement of classmates and the most difficult aspect was deciding how to involve the students with disabilities in regular class activities. Both groups recommended a high level of communication among special and regular educators and suggested that initial integration efforts should involve teachers who volunteer to take part. Regular educators had difficulty identifying positive changes in the students with disabilities while special educators did not. Appendixes contain copies of questionnaires used and response summaries. (Contains 39 references.) (Author/JDD)

ED 364 041

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Regular Class Integration

Feedback from Teachers and Classmates

by
Jennifer York, Terri Vandercook, and Cathy Macdonald
Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota
and
Cheri Heise-Neff and Ellen Caughey
Intermediate District 916, White Bear Lake, Minnesota

EC 302611

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Regular Class Integration of Middle School Students with Severe Disabilities: Feedback From Teachers and Classmates

By:

Jennifer York, Terri Vandercook, and Cathy Macdonald
Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota

and

Cheri Heise-Neff and Ellen Caughey
John Glenn and Roseville Area Middle Schools, Intermediate District 916
White Bear Lake, Minnesota

Revised and republished as: York, J., Vandercook, T., Macdonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (In press). Feedback from teachers and classmates about integrating middle school students with severe disabilities in general education classes. Exceptional Children.

September 1989

University of Minnesota
Institute on Community Integration
109 Pattee Hall, 150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
(612) 624-4512

The citation for this monograph is: York, J., Vandercook, T., Macdonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughey, E. (1989). Regular class integration of middle school students with severe disabilities: Feedback from teachers and classmates. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

Project Report Number 89-5

Additional copies of this publication are available from:

Institute on Community Integration
Publications Office
109 Pattee Hall
150 Pillsbury Drive SE
Minneapolis, MN 55455
(612) 624-4512

ABSTRACT

Regular educators, special educators, and classmates without disabilities were surveyed at the end of the first year that middle school students with severe disabilities were integrated into regular education classes in two suburban midwestern communities. Results of this preliminary study revealed many benefits for educators and students. Educators and classmates concurred that positive outcomes, particularly in the area of social competence, were realized by the students with severe disabilites. Acceptance of students with severe disabilities by classmates was considered to have increased substantially. Educators felt the regular class integration experiences were positive for themselves and for students, although there were differences in perspectives between regular and special educators. Many constructive suggestions for future regular class integration pursuits resulted also. Implications for practice and research are offered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special appreciation is extended to the students, team members, and families in the school communities of the Roseville Area Middle School in Little Canada, Minnesota and John Glenn Middle School in Mpalewood, Minnesota for their pioneering efforts at including students with severe disabilities into regular educaiton middle school classes. Their feedback captured in this monograph has been critical in moving forward on inclusive educational practices.

This monograph was developed with support by Grant No. G008630347-88 from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U. S. Department of Education; and the Minnesota Integrated Education Technical Assistance Project Grant No. 37010-57613 from the Minnesota Department of Education. Points of view or opinions stated in this report do not necessarily represent the official position of the U. S. or Minnesota Departments of Education and no official endorsement should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT i

PROJECT BACKGROUND 2

METHOD 2

Teacher, Classmate, and Regular Class Descriptions 3

Instrument 5

Procedures 5

RESULTS 6

Feedback from Regular Educators 6

Feedback from Special Educators 8

Feedback from Classmates 11

DISCUSSION 19

Implications for Practice and Research 24

CONCLUSION 29

REFERENCES 30

APPENDIX A: Regular Class Integration Feedback Questionnaire Protocols 33

APPENDIX B: Regular Educators Response Summaries 41

APPENDIX C: Special Educators Response Summaries 51

APPENDIX D: Classmates Response Summaries 63

REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION OF MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES: FEEDBACK FROM TEACHERS AND CLASSMATES

Designing a system of education in which children with quite diverse, heterogenous needs are educated in the same classrooms and that requires a merger of special and regular education resources is the current topic of great debate, referred to as the Regular Education Initiative (REI). The proponents of REI claim that a merged system in which regular education owns all children and in which individualized adaptations and supports are made available to all children will better meet the needs of all children (Gartner & Lipsky, 1987; Lilly, 1988; Reynolds, Wang, & Walberg, 1987; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Stainback & Stainback, 1989; Will, 1986). The opponents of REI are concerned that a merger of systems could do harm, particularly to those children who currently lack adequate support services and that there is an inadequate research base to advocate such a drastic change in systems design (Kaufman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Lieberman, 1985; Messinger, 1985; Vergason & Anderegg, 1989) Initially, the focus of the Regular Education Initiative debate was children with mild disabilities. A major REI issue related to these children has involved choice of curricular content and outcomes that parallel the regular education academic curriculum. The questions and concerns posed in the Regular Education Initiative discussion are generally of direct relevance to learners with more severe disabilities also (Zeph, 1988). For these students, however, adherence to the regular education curricular standards and outcomes is not a major issue. Instead, the issue centers on: (1) the need for children with severe disabilities to learn in natural environments in which age appropriate models of behavior and in which functional demands for performance are operative; and (2) the need for children with severe disabilities and their peers to learn about each other and develop the positive interdependence necessary to be part of the same community. The classmates and friends of today are the coworkers, neighbors and friends of tomorrow. In essence, given that positive interdependence cannot develop in separate environments, can the educational needs of children with severe disabilities be met in regular, integrated school and community environments?

Increasingly, there are demonstrations of children with severe disabilities attending their home/neighborhood schools and regular classes with same age peers who do not have labels (Biklen, 1985; Ford & Davern, 1989; Giangreco & Meyer, 1988; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Thousand et al., 1986). There are numerous reports that benefits can be realized by children with severe disabilities and their peers without disabilities who are afforded the opportunity to grow up and learn together, and even become friends (Elias, 1986; Forest, 1986; Hanline & Halvorsen, 1989; Strully & Strully, 1985). Because inclusion of students with severe disabilities in regular education classes is a relatively recent phenomenon, however, very little empirical data have been systematically collected and analyzed about the outcomes of regular class integration and about strategies for making it work.

Davis (1989), in his review of the Regular Education Initiative, identifies several problems with the current discussion, including the lack of involvement of school district personnel. Most of the information in published literature has been from university special education personnel. The purpose of conducting this study was to obtain and share information from regular educators, special educators, and classmates without disabilities concerning the inclusion of students who have severe disabilities in middle school regular education classes. The study was conducted as part of a federally funded three year integration project.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

To design, implement and evaluate integrated education programs for middle school students with severe disabilities were the purposes of a three year federally funded project with implementation sites in the suburban Twin Cities, Minnesota area. The middle school students with severe disabilities involved in the first year of the project had all moved to the school from a segregated wing of a regular elementary school. Virtually no interaction with peers without disabilities had occurred in elementary school. During the first year of the project, primary emphasis was placed on (1) developing a community based component to the program, and (2) designing and implementing cooperative recreation/leisure opportunities in which students with severe disabilities and their peers without disabilities could participate. At the end of the first year, however, the focus of the project shifted to address the integration of the students with severe disabilities into regular education homerooms and classes. There were two primary reasons for this change. First, regular class integration was the topic of increasing discussion in the professional education literature, at conferences, and from families and advocates. Second, an inordinate amount of time was spent designing special opportunities for interactions between students with severe disabilities and peers without disabilities when there were many naturally occurring interaction opportunities (e.g., regular classes) that could be used (York, Thurlow, & Vandercook, 1988). Project personnel felt that maintenance of change would be enhanced if successful strategies for interaction were infused in naturally occurring integrated environments and activities (e.g., regular classes and extracurricular activities). At the end of the first project year, the parameters of an integrated education for the middle school students were reconceptualized as an individually determined balance between instruction in regular education classes and off campus, community environments.

During the first project year, there were two regular middle schools located in one of the local school districts in which students served by the Intermediate District attended school. Students with moderate disabilities attended one of these schools. Students with more severe disabilities attended the other school. Project activities were directed primarily toward the school attended by students with more severe disabilities during the first project year. For the second project year, however, students were reassigned to two new middle schools based on geography instead of disability label. Project resources were then allocated to provide support in both middle schools. For the second project year, therefore, there were two substantial changes. The first was a shift to greater emphasis on regular class integration. The second was an expansion to two new school communities, serving a greater number of students with more heterogenous needs.

Each of the middle schools was located in a different suburban community of the Twin Cities, Minnesota area. One middle school (I) for grades 7-9 had a student population of approximately 1500, of which 18 had severe disabilities. The other middle school (II) was for grades 6-8 and had a student population of approximately 1200, of which 24 had severe disabilities. During the second project year, the goal was to integrate all the students with disabilities into regular education homerooms in the two "new" schools and to demonstrate effective examples of integration into selected regular education classes. (See York & Vandercook, 1989 for a discussion of building level strategies for changing to an integrated education for middle school students.) As part of this effort, feedback was solicited from the involved special educators, regular educators, and classmates.

METHOD

In both the project middle schools, students changed classes every period, with the exception of some sixth grade classes. In middle school I, it was the second year that students with severe disabilities attended that school but the first year in which regular class integration efforts were initiated. In middle school II, it was the first year that students with severe disabilities attended the

school, as well as the first year of regular class integration. In the second project year, regular class integration efforts started slowly. By the end of the year, selected students with severe disabilities were included in eight regular education classes and 8 homerooms.

In the third project year, regular class integration increased substantially. By the end of the third project year, almost all of the 42 students with severe disabilities were based in regular education homerooms and attended at least one regular class. Several of the students spent no or very little time in special education classes. In addition, at one of the middle school sites, the three special education teachers responsible for the students with severe disabilities functioned as regular education homeroom teachers which involved teaching the district's RAP time curriculum (a 15 minute period where teachers act as advisors to students and teach a series of curricular units on current teenage issues) and conducting parents conferences for their assigned regular education advisees. Most of the students continued to receive instruction in community environments also.

Teacher, Classmate, and Regular Class Descriptions

The teachers involved in this study during the first year of regular class integration efforts were the 11 regular educators of the classes into which the students with severe disabilities were integrated and the seven special educators of the students who were included in regular classes. Eight of the regular educators had students integrated into their regular homerooms and in subject area classes. Three had students in their homerooms only. The classmates involved in this study were 181 middle school students without disabilities who attended the regular education classes in which one to three students with severe disabilities were integrated. Excluded were classmates involved in integrated homerooms only. Table 1 summarizes descriptive information about the integration in regular classes, excluding homerooms.

The regular education classes into which the students with severe disabilities were integrated consisted of four academic (i.e., science, reading, and two social studies classes) and four non-academic (i.e., industrial technology, health, and two physical education classes) regular education classes. The regular education classroom teachers were selected for involvement in regular class integration initiatives by the building principal or the special education staff. All regular educators who were approached chose to participate. Each regular educator was asked to commit to a short "trial" period after which time a decision would be made about continuing the integration. Some of the regular educators requested that the students with severe disabilities be integrated into selected periods of the day. Whenever possible, the regular educators chose to have students integrated into classes (1) that had a relatively small number of students, (2) in which they projected that classmates would be most accepting, and (3) in which there was a tendency for more cooperative or individualized activities as opposed to mostly lecture. Some classes, however, were large, had classmates perceived to be "tough," and were largely a lecture format. Class sizes ranged from 18 to 31 students with a mean of 23 students per class.

In four of the classes, only one student with severe disabilities was integrated. In three of the classes, two students with severe disabilities were integrated. In one class, there were three students integrated. All of the students with disabilities attended the regular classes every day that the classes met, with the exception of the two social studies classes. The social studies teacher invited students to attend on days that were not primarily lecture. Some classes spanned the entire year. Others were only a semester or quarter long. Not all of the students with severe disabilities began their respective regular classes the first day the classes met due to logistical factors (e.g., classes were not identified until September of the school year). Once integrated, however, all students remained in their respective classes for its duration, i.e., no students were removed from the regular classes after the agreed upon "trial" period. At the time the questionnaire was administered, students with disabilities had attended their classes for an average of 3.75 months with a range of involvement from two months to 7.5 months.

Table 1:
Descriptors of regular class participation

MIDDLE SCHOOL	CLASS	GRADE	CLASS SIZE	CLASS MEMBERS WITH DISABILITIES	CLASS ATTENDANCE BY STUDENT(S) WITH DISABILITIES	
					FREQUENCY	DURATION**
I	Science	8	24	2	5 days per week	7.5 months
I	Reading	9	22	2	5 days per week	4 months
I	Industrial Technology	9	18	1	5 days per week	6 months
I	Physical Education A	7	24	1	5 days per week	2.5 months
II	Physical Education B	8	22	1	5 days per week (all but 1 unit)	4 months
II	Social Studies A	7	31	2	once per week*	2 months
II	Social Studies B	7	26	1	once per week*	2 months
II	Health	6	27	3	5 days per week	2 months

* Students with disabilities attended class on activity days only (e.g., no lecture).
** Indicates number of months from initiation in class to administration of questionnaire. Questionnaires were administered in April (School I) and May (School II). All students remained in classes to the end of the school year.

The students with severe disabilities carried labels of moderate to profound mental retardation. Some had motoric, vision and hearing difficulties also. In all eight of the regular classes, a special education support person was present initially. The need for intensive support in terms of a special education staff person being constantly present and assisting the student(s) with disabilities lessened in each of the regular classes. The support person was removed in three of the regular education classes but in eight homerooms.

Instrument

In a review of integration literature, no instruments could be located that were designed for the specific purpose of obtaining feedback from educators and classmates about regular class integration. Further, none were designed to target information about specific individuals and integration experiences. The located instruments were designed to measure attitude and acceptance related to the integration of "students with disabilities" instead of related to individual experiences with specific students who have disabilities. The purpose of this study was to obtain feedback from educators and classmates without identified disabilities about their specific experiences with individual students with severe disabilities integrated into regular classes. Therefore, a new instrument was developed. An open-ended format was selected over a more objective format so as not to limit the range of responses or to make a priori decisions about the types of responses that might be generated.

Special and regular education staff from each building and university personnel discussed the kinds of feedback they would like from the educators and from the classmates without disabilities. The two page questionnaire for the regular and special educators asked respondents to explain why they were interested in and willing to have students with disabilities in regular classes, to describe how the students with disabilities were involved in class activities, to identify the most difficult and the best or most interesting aspects of the integration, to discuss outcomes and changes for themselves and for the students, to identify effects that occurred beyond class time, and to provide recommendations about how to make regular class integration work. The one page questionnaire for the classmates asked the respondents to indicate whether they thought that regular class integration was a good idea, to identify changes they noticed in the peers with disabilities, to discuss things that they had learned, and to identify additional classes and other activities in which students with disabilities could be involved. The questionnaires were individualized for each regular class by inserting into the questions the names of the specific students with severe disabilities who were integrated into the respective classes. For example: "Do you think it is a good idea for John to be integrated in regular classes like your reading class?" The assumption was made that responses might vary depending upon each individual student. Knowing the specific students involved might allow analysis of outcomes that related to their unique characteristics and abilities. Further, the authors thought that by asking about specific students, the notion that not all students with severe disabilities are the same might be reinforced. Examples of the questionnaires administered to the educators and to the classmates are provided in Appendix A.

Procedures

In April (middle school I) and May (middle school II) of the first year of regular class integration, questionnaires were administered to the regular educators, special educators, and classmates involved in the regular class integration efforts for the students with severe disabilities. Special education staff personally distributed the questionnaires to the educators who then responded independently to the questions in writing. The regular education classroom teachers administered the questionnaires to all classmates who were present on the day of administration. Each classmate completed the questionnaire independently, although the classroom teacher read each of the

questions aloud, to assure understanding. The students with disabilities were not present in the class when the questionnaires were completed.

Individual responses to each question were typed onto one master questionnaire for the regular educators (see Appendix B) and one for the special educators (see Appendix C). Classmate responses were summarized related to each class for each question (see Appendix D). Broad response categories were defined for each question. The individual responses were then coded by category and frequencies and percentages calculated independently by two people. The percentage of respondents, as opposed to responses, was calculated for each category. This was done so that subjects who provided more than one response would not have a greater influence on the overall data summaries and percentages. In situations where responses from the same subject fell into different categories, each category was credited with a response. When multiple responses from the same subject fell into the same category, that category was credited with only one response. Percentages reported within categories, therefore, are unduplicated. Reliability between the two persons coding and analyzing data was determined for each teacher and classmate response to each question. Anecdotal recordings were made of specific responses that were considered to be representative of the types of responses to each question or that were considered to be particularly insightful or unique.

RESULTS

Results are presented separately for the regular educators, special educators, and classmates. All results, except where noted, were calculated and reported in terms of percentage of respondents, not percentage of responses. When considering the number and percentage of respondents who provided the same responses, remember that the questions were open-ended and not multiple choice. Given an open-ended format, a lower percentage of similar responses would be expected than if a multiple choice format were employed.

Feedback from Regular Educators

Each of the 11 regular educators who had students with severe disabilities integrated into at least one subject area class or homeroom for most of the school year responded to the questionnaire. Results are reported for each question. Even though the questions were an open-ended format, many of the teachers provided similar responses. Reliability for coding and categorizing individual responses to each question ranged from 88% to 100%, with an overall average of 93.62%.

When asked why they were willing and interested in having students with severe disabilities in their regular classes, five of the teachers stated that regular class integration would provide an opportunity for classmates to learn about peers with disabilities. Three of the teachers also believed that it was a professional responsibility and were interested in working with all students no matter what the disability. For three of the teachers, the challenge and innovative aspects of integration were appealing, as evidenced by this response "*I like to try new adventures. It keeps my 33 year career exciting.*" Two teachers indicated wanting to learn more about students with disabilities.

Involvement of the students with disabilities in regular classes was reported by nine of the eleven teachers to be the same as their classmates as evidenced by this response "*J did all of the activities that the other students participated in.*" That is, very few different but parallel activities were designed. Over half (six) of the regular educators specifically referenced involvement of classmates. Examples of responses indicating classmate involvement were "*most were very involved- kids in class seemed willing to help*" and "*there were some activities that J was unable to do so her partner did all of the scoring...*" For the two social studies classes in which the students were not full time

members, the teacher provided the following response "*I felt that to have them the entire hour was counterproductive for them. Most [class activities] involve reading and writing which left the special kids out in the cold. Because of this, I don't think they ever felt part of the group.*"

The most difficult aspect of regular class integration indicated by six of the regular educators was deciding how to include the students with disabilities in regular class activities as evidenced by the following responses: "*knowing what to expect from various skill levels and how to fit them into a class and not take anything away from the regular class*" and "*trying to make sure the daily lesson was something the students could participate in.*" Three of the teachers responded that they had no or very little difficulty including the students. Two of these three explained that the special education teacher assumed most of the responsibility for designing strategies for including the student with disabilities. Two teachers mentioned inadequate time to work individually with the students with disabilities. One teacher explained how class size affects instruction in general with implications for integration as well: "*I tried to get them into my better or smaller classes, too many kids are too many no matter what their abilities are.*"

The majority of regular educators (eight of eleven) concurred that the best and most interesting aspect of the integration was the positive reactions of the classmates without disabilities. The science teacher responded: "*To see the genuine concern and acceptance of these kids and to know that they are seen as a very real part of the class.*" Four of the teachers mentioned that seeing the students with disabilities enjoy the class was the best aspect. An art teacher offered that "*the best part of the integration was that the students [with severe disabilities] coming into my class get enjoyment from their work.*"

When asked to identify the outcomes or changes attributed to regular class integration experiences for regular and special education teachers and for the regular and special education students, responses were quite varied but almost exclusively positive. Nine of the eleven teachers indicated changes related to themselves. Of these nine, six indicated positive outcomes (e.g., new colleagues, ready to have more students, personal reward because of student gains, social advantages outweigh concerns). Two of the nine indicated little or no change. One teacher was concerned about liability in physical education class. Three of the regular educators indicated changes for the special educators. Two of the teachers provided positive comments and indicated that the special educators probably felt more a part of the school, enjoyed their involvement with typical kids, and enjoyed seeing the students with severe disabilities function in a regular class. One teacher responded that the special education teacher appeared uncomfortable and unsure about what to do in the regular class.

Nine of the teachers indicated changes and outcomes for the regular education students. Six of the nine responded that classmate acceptance, understanding, and the realization of similarities with students with disabilities had increased. One indicated that some regular education students did not know what to do or how to interact. Only four of the eleven regular educators provided responses indicating change in the students with disabilities. All four of the responses were positive and generally indicated that the students with disabilities were part of the group and were accepted by classmates.

Eight of the eleven teachers responded to the question about effects of regular class integration that extended beyond class time. Five of the eight indicated effects beyond class time, such as more interactions between regular and special educators, between classmates and peers with disabilities, between special educators and classmates, and between regular educators and students with disabilities. Most responses indicated that effects were increased in informal interactions (e.g., greetings in the hallways). Three of the educators indicated having no knowledge of effects beyond class time.

When asked to provide recommendations about continuing regular class integration and to give advice to others initiating regular class integration, there was considerable consensus in the responses. Of the eight who responded, all eight recommended continuation of regular class integration efforts. Some qualified their responses by stating that integration in homerooms and in selective classes should be pursued. The need for ongoing communication among regular and special educators was recommended by five of the eight. Two recommended starting integration efforts on a voluntary basis.

Feedback from Special Educators

Each of the seven special educators who had students with severe disabilities integrated into at least one regular class responded to the questionnaire. Results are reported for each question. Even though the questions were in open-ended format, many of the teachers provided similar responses. Reliability for coding and categorizing individual responses to each question ranged from 85.70% to 100% for each question, with an overall average of 94.59%.

When asked why they were interested in having their students with severe disabilities integrated into regular classes, five of the seven special educators responded that it would provide an opportunity for their students to interact with peers who do not have disabilities. Four of the seven indicated that regular class integration would provide an opportunity for their students to learn new skills, specifically to learn from peers who do not have disabilities. Representative quotes were: "*It is important for students without disabilities to have them [students with disabilities] in their classes so they can get to know them as individuals*" and "*students [with disabilities] need to develop their social skills repertoires and peers without disabilities serve as excellent models.*" One teacher was interested in regular class integration because it provided the opportunity to team with regular educators, to get to know regular education students, and to feel more a part of the school community.

Special education teachers provided extensive detail as to how the students with disabilities were involved in the regular classes. In general, the students were involved in the same activities as the classmates. Also mentioned was that classmates provided various types of support (e.g., assistance in finding the correct seat). A special education staff person was present most of the time in the classroom. In one class where the activities were not the same, the student with severe disabilities was involved in developing his picture schedule and shopping list while classmates worked on individualized reading assignments. The special educator explained that several classmates took turns assisting the student develop his picture schedule of daily activities and that through this experience the classmates learned more about the student's day. As a result, these classmates had more to talk about with the student.

Four of the seven special educators responded that developing strategies for including the students with disabilities into the regular class activities (e.g., creating adaptations, deciding on objectives, using age appropriate materials) was the most difficult aspect of the integration. Three also mentioned logistics, such as scheduling and time, as being difficulties. Two quotes represented these findings well.

> "*Scheduling, logistics. If a student has both a.m. and p.m. regular classes, when do we fit in community instruction?*"

> "*Evaluating the experience and deciding what the next move would be (e.g., adaptations, objectives)- only because it was thought provoking, a challenge, not particularly difficult.*"

Four of the seven teachers reported that the best aspect of regular integration was the acceptance of the students with disabilities by their classmates without disabilities. There were several specific references to friendships that had developed as a result of the integration. Four of the teachers responded that the skill acquisition by the students with severe disabilities was the best aspect of regular class integration. The aspect of regular class integration experiences considered most interesting varied considerably among teachers. The following quotes represent the diversity of responses and perspectives as to the most interesting aspect of regular class integration.

> *"Seeing students in such a different environment was really eye opening. If we build a wall around them so they are in special environments, how do special education teachers and students learn about typical situations and expectations?"*

> *"The experience allowed me to see how a severely disabled learner can learn skills in an integrated environment that previously I felt could not be learned given the success in the special education classroom. Skills and behaviors often reinforced in special education classrooms are often inappropriate in regular classrooms (e.g., talking out of turn, hugging)."*

> *"[student with moderate disabilities] did not have the social success I expected. I thought [student with severe disabilities] would have more trouble. Just the reverse happened."*

> *"You can't read this in a book. You must experience it."*

> *"We're part of it. Interacting and planning with the [regular education] teacher- learning from each other."*

> *"The best aspect of the experience was a regular education teacher commenting that It's not intellect that is a measure of success and whether or not people want to be around you. It's pleasantness."*

Five of the seven special educators responded that an outcome for the regular educators was a better understanding of how to involve students with disabilities in regular class activities. Two mentioned that they felt the regular educators were less anxious about integration. Two responded that regular educators had developed new colleagues and friends through their regular class integration efforts. Special educators also mentioned that regular educators had learned new strategies for working with "typical" kids who were falling through the cracks. Further, special educators indicated that some of the regular educators received a lot of reinforcement and appreciation for involvement in regular class activities.

When asked to indicate changes or outcomes related to themselves, the special educators indicated that they had developed a new perspective on education by learning more about the regular education system. Also mentioned was a feeling of being more part of the school community. One teacher specifically indicated feeling more confident that regular class integration was good for all kids.

All seven of the special educators indicated that classmate acceptance of peers with disabilities and recognition of more similarities than differences was a positive outcome for the classmates without disabilities. Positive outcomes for students with disabilities reflected greater inclusion in the community as well as increased growth. Two representative quotes were: *"they can't go any place in the school without kids talking to them"* and *"they are more a part of the school community."* Four identified improved social skills and curricular skills as outcomes for students with disabilities. One

teacher described further that students with disabilities were interacting to a greater degree with peers instead of just with adults.

> *"Learning to interact with peers, not just adults. He is around peers who can interact and who are more socially competent. There is always some amount of 'down time' in the special education class. At least when in a regular class, 'down time' still provides the opportunity to learn and interact."*

Two special educators indicated that students with disabilities were highly motivated to go to class and thought that for some it was the highlight of their school day.

All seven of the special educators responded that effects of regular class integration had extended beyond class time in the form of social interactions and greetings, especially in the hallways, at lunch, and on the way to the buses. Three special educators specifically referenced friendships that had developed in regular classes and extended beyond class time. Four teachers provided specific occurrences of generalized interactions during lunch and after school activities.

When asked for recommendations about how to expand regular class integration efforts, five of the seven special educators recommended increased communication with and by regular educators. Specific examples included hanging out with and getting to know regular educators, increasing knowledge of regular education curriculum and regular school life, clarifying expectations for working together and outcomes expected of students, and using regular educators who had been involved in regular class integration experiences to share information and recruit involvement of other faculty.

When asked for recommendations about how other schools might initiate regular class integration efforts, the responses were quite varied. Two of the special educators thought it was important to stress the benefits for teachers and students derived from building more inclusive school communities. Other recommendations included: (a) letting IEP teams make decisions for individual kids, (b) using an in-house person to help get things started, (c) establishing a building-based integration committee, (d) providing inservice to all regular education staff and students, and (e) beginning with volunteers. Two responses were particularly instructive:

> *"It does take time to plan and set up the purpose and goals for the students involved. However, participation and acceptance seems to come naturally. After a week in the class our students were just one of the class."*

> *"Permanency is essential. We had to start over this year because we are at a new school. If we were back at last year's school, there would be much, much more involvement in regular classes. Must build relationships and consistency."*

Finally, the special educators were asked how they would justify the continuation of regular class integration to administrators, colleagues, and community members. Five of the seven teachers responded to this question. Four suggested emphasizing the benefits to special education learners, such as increased responsibility and positive behavior changes. Three recommended discussing the benefits to regular education students, particularly that the learning resulting from integration is helpful in all areas of life. Two representative quote were:

> *"Participating in a regular education class was a great and normal setting for our students to learn self discipline, responsibility for themselves and their materials, scheduling of classes and a commitment to be there. The other students benefitted from the experience of working and participating with and being a friend to our students. This was great for everyone involved and provided a natural environment with the natural consequences of acceptance and taking responsibility for oneself."*

"Regular education peers are the future decision makers, neighbors, mayors, etc. Special education students are no different than other minorities. They are perceived as different from the norm. After integration similarities are more apparent."

Feedback from Classmates

Classmate responses are reported for each specific class, as well as for all 181 of the respondents. The vast majority of respondents answered each of four questions with the exception of the final section of question 4 which appeared to be confusing. Results are provided for each specific question. Except where noted, percentages reflect percent of respondents not responses. Reliability for coding and categorizing individual responses to each question ranged from 87.34 to 99.45 percent with an overall average of 94.07 percent.

Is regular class integration a good idea? The first question asked classmates without disabilities to indicate whether they thought that it was a good idea for their specific classmate with a severe disability to be integrated in their specific class (Table 2). All 181 of the subjects responded to this question. Responses were categorized as "yes," "no," or "other." Reliability for coding the responses to this question ranged from 94.12% to 100% for specific classes, with an average for all classes of 99.45%.

Nearly all (89.50%) of the classmates responded "yes." Affirmative responses ranged from 73.91% to 100% in specific classes. Many respondents elaborated on their "yes" responses with statements such as *"they need to be around normal people," "it teaches her more stuff," "so she don't feel different because she's not," "they learn more and we want to learn more about them" and "she can join in with other people and make friends."* Very few respondents answered either "no" (5.52%) or provided another response (4.98%). Responses categorized as "other" included statements such as "maybe," "yes and no," and "I don't care."

In an effort to determine differences that might exist given variations among classes and students, further analyses were conducted which grouped respondents by school, type of class (e.g., academic or non-academic), grade level, degree of student disability as defined by mental retardation label, and consistency of attendance by students with disabilities (Table 3). In comparing the percentages derived from these additional analyses, little or no difference based on type of class, grade level, severity of intellectual handicap, or attendance was apparent. The greatest difference was evident in percentage variations between the two middle schools, with classmates in middle school II giving a higher percentage of "yes" responses than those in middle school I.

Were changes noticed in students with disabilities? The second question asked classmates without disabilities to indicate the changes that they had noticed in an individual classmate with a disability since regular class integration began. For classes in which more than one student with severe disabilities were integrated, space was provided on the questionnaire to respond separately related to each integrated student. Ninety-six percent of the subjects responded to this question. Responses were coded into four broad categories: "no changes/not sure," "positive changes," "negative changes," and "other changes" (Table 4). Reliability for coding responses for individual classes ranged from 72.22% to 100%, with an average reliability across classes of 93.88%.

There was considerable variability in responses among classes. In one class (Physical Education B), all classmates noted positive changes in their peer with a disability. In another class (Industrial Technology), less than half (47.06%) of the classmates noticed positive changes. On the

Table 2:
Agreement that regular class integration is a good idea:
Responses by class

	YES (%)	NO (%)	OTHER (%)
SCIENCE (n=22)	91.00	4.54	4.54
READING (n=20)	75.00	20.00	5.00
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY (n=17)	88.00	5.89	5.89
PHYSICAL EDUCATION A (n=23)	73.91	8.70	17.40
PHYSICAL EDUCATION B (n=21)	100.00	0.00	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES A (n=29)	89.66	6.90	3.45
SOCIAL STUDIES B (n=25)	100.00	0.00	0.00
HEALTH (n=24)	95.83	0.00	4.17
TOTAL (n=181)	89.50	5.52	4.98

Table 3:
Agreement that regular class integration is a good idea:
Responses by school, type of class, grade level, disability label, and attendance

	YES (%)	NO (%)	OTHER (%)
SCHOOL I (n=82)	81.71	9.76	8.54
SCHOOL II (n=99)	95.96	2.02	2.02
ACADEMIC CLASSES[1] (n=96)	89.58	7.29	3.13
NONACADEMIC CLASSES (n=85)	89.41	3.53	7.06
GRADES 6 AND 7 (n=101)	90.10	3.96	5.94
GRADES 8 AND 9 (n=80)	88.75	7.50	3.75
MODERATE LABEL[2] (n=97)	89.69	4.12	6.19
SEVERE LABEL (n=84)	89.29	7.14	3.57
MEMBERS[3] (n=127)	87.40	6.30	5.51
VISITORS (n=54)	94.44	3.70	1.85

[1] Academic classes: science, reading, social studies; Nonacademic classes: industrial technology, physical education, health.

[2] Students with labels of moderate mental retardation were in physical education A & B, social studies A, health; Students with labels of severe or profound mental retardation were in science, industrial technology, social studies B.

[3] Member status was defined as class attendance same as classmates without disabilities. Member classes were science, reading, industrial technology, physical education A and B, and health; Classes in which students were visitors were social studies A and B.

Table 4:
Changes in peers with disabilities:
Responses for each peer by class

	NO CHANGES/ NOT SURE (%)	POSITIVE CHANGES (%)	NEGATIVE CHANGES (%)	OTHER CHANGES (%)
SCIENCE				
• Learner 1 (n=24)	4.17	91.67	4.17	0.00
• Learner 2 (n=21)	9.52	90.48	0.00	0.00
READING				
• Learner 1 (n=18)	11.11	66.67	22.22	5.56
• Learner 2 (n=13)	15.38	84.62	0.00	0.00
I-TECH				
• Learner 1 (n=17)	52.94	47.06	0.00	0.00
PHYS ED - A				
Learner 1 (n=22)	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00
PHYS ED - B				
Learner 1 (n=19)	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES - A				
Learner 1 (n=27)	29.63	66.67	3.70	0.00
Learner 2 (n=26)	38.46	61.54	0.00	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES - B				
Learner 1 (n=25)	20.00	80.00	0.00	0.00
HEALTH				
Learner 1 (n=23)	4.35	95.65	0.00	0.00
Learner 2 (n=21)	14.29	85.71	0.00	0.00
Learner 3 (n=22)	40.91	59.09	0.00	0.00
TOTAL (n=279)	22.58	74.91	2.15	0.36

Total percentage can be more than 100 because some respondents might have indicated positive (+), negative (-), and other changes.

average across all classes, 77.10% of the classmates noticed changes in their classmate(s) with severe disabilities since the onset of regular class integration.

The vast majority (74.91%) of respondents indicated positive changes in their classmates with severe disabilities, ranging from 47.06% to 100% for specific classes. The positive responses were further categorized as social, curricular, or other positive changes (Table 5). Many respondents indicated both social and curricular changes in their classmates with disabilities. Positive social changes included responses that classmates were more social, talkative, calm, happy, appropriate, cooperative, fun, responsible, grown up, friendly, spontaneous, confident, independent, and creative. Many classmates also indicated that their classmate with a severe disability had more friends. Also considered positive social changes were responses that classmates were less noisy and shy, talked out of turn less, asked others to do things less, and engaged in less hugging. A positive change was coded as a curricular change if the response referenced learning and participating to a greater degree in class activities even if curricular content skills (e.g., earth science, anatomy) were not mentioned specifically. Although this is a rather broad definition of curricular changes, there were reliably noted differences between changes perceived as mostly social versus those which connoted involvement in classroom activities. Examples of positive curricular changes included references that a classmate "*knows a lot more,*" "*has gotten more involved in their work,*" "*is making good progress,*" "*is more attentive,*" "*asks a lot of questions,*" "*wants to do the work,*" "*is smarter,*" and "*has learned to understand what goes on.*" There were also positive responses that could not be coded as either social or curricular. These responses comprised the "other" positive category and included responses such as "*knows new surroundings,*" "*shuts off the light and closes the door,*" "*is more familiar with the class,*" and "*setting goals and going far beyond them.*"

Negative changes were indicated for only three of the thirteen students with severe disabilities. Overall, only 2.15% of the respondents indicated negative changes. For one of the students with severe disabilities (learner 1 in reading class), four of her classmates (22.22%) indicated negative changes. For the other two students with disabilities for whom negative changes were indicated, only one classmate in each of the two classes indicated negative changes. Examples of negative responses included: "*she doesn't want to work anymore,*" "*she has become less shy and more stuck up,*" "*she thinks she can go smacking people in the face,*" "*he has gotten rowdier by sitting with G and P,*" and "*he swears a lot and hits people.*"

For the classes in which a relatively high percentage of classmates indicated no change in their classmate with a severe disability, individual responses were retrieved to determine whether the content of the responses provided insight as to why no change was noted. In Industrial Technology, 52.94% of the classmates indicated no change. Knowing the structure of the class and considering the nature of the classmate responses may provide some insight as to why. Representative responses were "*I haven't noticed,*" "*I haven't watched,*" "*nothing,*" and "*I haven't checked,*" which may reflect that groups of students worked in relative isolation from other groups. The constant presence of the special educator assisting the student might have contributed to the isolation also. In Physical Education A, half of the classmates indicated no change in their classmate. Examples of the actual responses were similar to those of Industrial Technology and included "*I haven't noticed,*" and "*I don't know her very well*" and might reflect either physical isolation or lack of perceived differences. In Social Studies A, about one third of the classmates (29.63% and 38.46%) indicated no change in two integrated students. One of the responses may provide insight as to why: "*they weren't here long enough.*" Finally, in Health, 40.91% of the classmates indicated no change in one of the three integrated classmates. Again, retrieving the actual responses suggested a possible reason. Responses included: "*it's hard to tell- only here for a little while,*" and "*don't know, have not been here in a long time.*" In two of these four classes, therefore, lack of regular attendance may have been a contributing factor to no observation of change.

Table 5:
Positive changes in peers with disabilities:
Responses for each peer by class

	POSITIVE CHANGES:			
	TOTAL (%)	SOCIAL (%)	CURRICULAR (%)	OTHER (%)
SCIENCE				
• Learner 1 (n=24)	91.67	66.67	41.67	4.17
• Learner 2 (n=21)	90.48	66.67	28.57	19.05
READING				
• Learner 1 (n=18)	66.67	33.33	27.78	5.56
• Learner 2 (n=13)	84.62	53.85	30.77	7.69
I-TECH				
• Learner 1 (n=17)	47.06	23.53	11.76	17.65
PHYS ED - A				
• Learner 1 (n=22)	50.00	27.27	22.73	0.00
PHYS ED - B				
• Learner 1 (n=19)	100.00	94.74	57.89	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES A				
• Learner 1 (n=27)	66.67	48.15	22.22	0.00
• Learner 2 (n=26)	61.54	42.31	26.92	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES B				
• Learner 1 (n=25)	80.00	72.00	8.00	0.00
HEALTH				
• Learner 1 (n=23)	95.65	73.91	30.43	0.00
• Learner 2 (n=21)	85.71	66.67	28.57	0.00
• Learner 3 (n=22)	59.09	45.45	22.73	0.00

Did classmates learn anything? The third question asked classmates without disabilities to indicate whether they learned anything by having peers with severe disabilities in their respective classes (Table 6). Eighty-seven percent of the respondents answered this question. Responses about what classmates learned from regular class integration were coded in the following categories: nothing/not much, something about their peer with a disability, something about themselves, and other. Responses in the learning something about their peer with a disability were coded further as positive, negative, and neutral. Reliability of coding individual responses for specific classes ranged from 71.43% to 100%, with an average of 87.34% across all classes.

About two thirds (63.29%) of the respondents indicated learning something about their classmate(s) with disabilities. Of these responses, the majority (51.27% of the 63.29%) indicated learning about positive attributes of their peers. The most frequent type of response related to learning that peers with disabilities were more alike than different from themselves as evidenced by these actual responses: *"she is just like us," "that even retarded kids are normal," "most people are the same," "they are just like us but in a different way."* Other responses indicated acceptance and accommodation of differences; for example: *"they can't help them rude things they do, it just happens"* and *"how to act around them - it's easy to do."* Other positive comments about classmates with disabilities included: *"they can handle it and should be in more classes," "that with some help, he can do a lot more than I thought he could," "kids may have a learning disability but she tries and she don't give up"* and *"that people like them aren't always no fun."* A few (3.16%) of the respondents indicated learning negative things about their classmate(s) with disabilities. These negative comments included: *"they can't learn," "he can't be quiet,"* and *"she don't get involved in class."* Responses about classmates with disabilities for which neither positive nor negative values could be assigned were grouped in the neutral category and accounted for 8.66% of the classmates responses. Examples of neutral responses included: *"it's hard to understand what goes on when you are disabled," "how disabled kids act and feel," "some kids are hard to teach,"* and *"some need extra help and encouragement to do well."* Some of the respondents merely indicated learning something but did not explain further, e.g., *"learned a lot by watching him," "what it is like to be like him," "the way he acts in a big group."*

Nearly one fifth (18.99%) of the respondents indicated learning "nothing" or "not much." About one sixth (15.16%) indicated learning something about themselves. Examples of actual responses from within this category included: *"it's good for us to have him around," "how important it is to treat people the same and not to make fun of them just because they have a problem," "to be more comfortable around them," "to respect others,"* and *"how to help them."*

Finally, 5.06% of the respondents indicated learning something that could not be categorized in any of the previous categories. These few comments included: "everyone has a right to learn," "that anybody has the right to join in a group with anybody they want" and "that people learn from watching other people."

Are there other classes and activities suitable for integration? The final question asked respondents to indicate other classes, school activities, extra-curricular activities, and after school and community activities in which they thought their specific classmate with a disability could be involved. Approximately three quarters (74.03%) of the respondents answered the first part of this question. A much smaller percentage answered the last three sections of the final question. Further, many of the responses provided did not match the question or could not be interpreted (e.g., responding "field trips" to a request for in school activities). Because of the low response rate and obvious confusion as to what the question was asking, data were analyzed only for the first part of the question.

Table 6:
What classmates learned:
Responses by class

	NOTHING/ NOT MUCH	SOMETHING ABOUT PEER WITH DISABILITY			SOMETHING ABOUT SELF	OTHER
		Positive	Negative	Other		
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
SCIENCE (n=19)	10.53	42.11	10.53	0.00	31.58	5.26
READING (n=14)	21.43	28.57	0.00	21.43	21.43	7.14
INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY (n=17)	35.29	58.85	5.88	0.00	5.88	5.88
PHYS ED A (n=20)	60.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
PHYS ED B (n=20)	0.00	85.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	5.00
SOCIAL STUDIES A (n=25)	16.00	56.00	4.00	4.00	16.00	4.00
SOCIAL STUDIES B (n=21)	9.52	33.33	4.76	33.33	9.52	9.52
HEALTH (n=22)	4.55	68.18	0.00	13.64	13.64	4.55
TOTAL (n=158)	18.99	51.27	3.16	8.86	15.19	5.06

Note: Percentage totals for each class (row) may add up to greater than 100% because some students provided more than one response.

Responses to the request to indicate additional specific regular education classes in which the specific classmate with a disability might be involved were analyzed in three ways. First, each response was coded in one of the following categories: "all/any classes," "some classes," and "no classes" (Table 7). Second, for respondents who indicated specific classes for involvement, responses were coded into academic and non-academic classes (Table 8). Finally, for respondents who indicated specific classes, a frequency record was kept for specific classes. Reliability for coding individual responses for respondents in each class ranged from 91.30% to 100%, with an average of 95.62% across classes.

Overall, 12.69% of the respondents indicated that their classmates with severe disabilities could be involved in all regular education classes (Table 7). Another 78.36% felt that classmates could attend at least some classes. Only 8.96% indicated that their classmate(s) with severe disabilities should not be involved in any regular education classes. Responses varied among classes. The majority of respondents (71.43% to 100%) in each class, however, indicated that their classmates with severe disabilities could be involved in at least some other classes. In one class, Physical Education B, the majority (61.90%) indicated that their classmate with severe disability could be involved in all classes.

In the second analysis for this question, references to specific academic or non-academic classes were recorded for each class of respondents (Table 8). This analysis was conducted in an effort to determine whether respondent involvement in either academic or non-academic class integration affected their responses. Of all the responses to this question, a little over half (56.72%) referenced non-academic classes. About one third (35.07%) referenced academic classes. A greater percentage of respondents in each class, except for reading, indicated involvement in non-academic classes than in academic classes.

In the third analysis for this question, a record was kept of how frequently specific classes were indicated as additional regular class integration options for the classmates with severe disabilities. Some of the respondents provided more than one response. There was a total of 176 responses that referenced specific classes. Reported here are the percentages of 176 responses. Recommendations for non-academic classes accounted for 60.23% of the responses, whereas specific academic classes accounted for 39.77%. Ranked from most to least frequently mentioned regular classes considered options for integration were: art (25.57%), English (11.36%), physical education (10.23%), math (9.66%), home economics (8.52%), science (8.52%), music/band (5.68%), industrial technology/shop (4.55%), health (3.98%), social studies (2.84%), computer (1.70%), geography (1.70%), and spelling (1.70%).

DISCUSSION

Feedback from educators and classmates about regular class integration initiatives in two middle schools indicated that, in general, integration was positive for students and teachers. Perhaps most remarkable was that all educators and the overwhelmingly majority of classmates recommended that regular class integration efforts continue. Educators stated this directly and classmates indicated this by responding that regular class integration was a good idea for a variety of reasons (question 1) and by suggesting additional regular classes into which students with severe disabilities might be integrated (question 4). Positive changes, especially in social and communication skills, were noted in the students with disabilities by special educators, regular educators, and classmates. Most of the classmates seemed to have benefited from the integration also, as evidenced by feedback from both groups of educators and from the classmates themselves. Overall, the findings were very positive and surprisingly uniform among the special educators, regular educators, and classmates. Comparing the responses from the regular educators with those

Table 7:
Other classes peers with severe disabilities might be involved in:
Responses by class

	ALL CLASSES (%)	SOME CLASSES (%)	NO CLASSES (%)
SCIENCE (n=12)	8.33	91.67	0.00
READING (n=9)	0.00	88.89	11.11
I-TECH (n=8)	0.00	75.00	25.00
PHYS ED A (n=21)	0.00	71.43	28.57
PHYS ED B (n=21)	61.90	38.10	0.00
SOCIAL STUDIES A (n=22)	9.09	86.36	4.55
SOCIAL STUDIES B (n=23)	4.35	86.96	8.70
HEALTH (n=16)	0.00	100.00	0.00
TOTAL (n=134)	12.69	78.36	8.96

Table 8:
Academic and nonacademic classes peers with disabilities might be involved in:
Responses by class

	ACADEMIC CLASSES (%)	NONACADEMIC CLASSES (%)
SCIENCE (n=12)	50.00	50.00
READING (n=9)	55.56	33.33
I-TECH (n=8)	12.50	50.00
PHYS ED A (n=21)	0.00	61.90
PHYS ED B (n=21)	47.62	47.62
SOCIAL STUDIES A (n=22)	36.36	63.63
SOCIAL STUDIES B (n=23)	30.43	56.52
HEALTH (n=18)	55.55	72.22
TOTAL (n=123)	38.21	61.79

from the special educators, however, did yield some instructive findings as did careful consideration of the findings from the classmates.

There were many similarities in the responses of special and regular educators. The primary reason for both groups to get involved in regular class integration initiatives was to provide opportunities for students with disabilities and their peers without disabilities to get to know and learn more about each other. Both groups indicated that the best aspect was the acceptance by and involvement of classmates. There were several specific references to friendships that had developed. Both groups felt that the most difficult aspect was deciding how to involve the students with disabilities in regular class activities. At the end of the school year, however, the special educators felt that they and the regular educators had a much better understanding of how to involve the students. Finally, both groups recommended that a high level of communication among special and regular educators is necessary and that initial regular class integration efforts should involve teachers who volunteer to take part. Although integration should not be considered a "voluntary" component of educational programs, and therefore optional, given the inevitable difficulties encountered in change and the corresponding need for affirmative problem-solving, initial demonstrations will be most successful if those willing to change are involved in the process (Berman, 1981; Goodman & Dean, 1982; Louis, 1986).

One area in which the regular and special educators differed somewhat in their responses relates to the outcomes identified for the students with disabilities. Regular educators had difficulty indicating changes in the students with disabilities. On the other hand, special educators had very little difficulty identifying positive changes. Reading the following two quotes, one from a regular educator and one from a special educator, about the same student in an industrial technology class provides an important insight to this apparent discrepancy.

> *"(student) ability to participate is very limited. He was able to move things from place to place, like moving boards from one process station to another. He also tried to help put tools away...I didn't notice change in (student). But (special educator) could see change so it seemed good for (student) to be here. Therefore, there was some reward for me." (regular educator)*

> *"(student) accomplished his IEP mobility goals... He is learning to transport things in his lap and put things away. Before I just hoped he wouldn't throw it. Less rocking. More watching. More initiation of wheeling around and exploring. He uses different routes to get to the same places." (special educator)*

This set of quotes seems to indicate reliability between the special educator and regular educator about the behaviors demonstrated by the student. The difference lies in their perceptions and interpretations of the behaviors. The special educator perceived the behaviors as a demonstration of positive growth and change. The regular educator did not have the same frame of reference from which to judge the behavior change. This is evidenced in another response from the same regular educator.

> *"I guess my advice would be to learn about the level of accomplishment that a special education student can hope to have. In education we must find it rewarding to share in the students' accomplishments and it was difficult for me to find rewards in working with (student) because things changed so slowly and the progress was so minute in comparison with other regular education students." (regular educator)*

A very important implication of this analysis is that special educators must communicate clearly the expectations for the students with disabilities and the accomplishments. Further evidence of the

importance of regular educators recognizing positive change and growth in students with disabilities can be found in the responses of several regular educators who indicated that the best aspect of the regular class integration efforts was the enjoyment in participation displayed by the students with severe disabilities.

Several interesting findings related to the responses of the classmates emerged also. First, classmates provided an extensive listing of positive changes in the students with severe disabilities, particularly changes in social competencies. The changes noted were positive interpersonal attributes that have been identified repeatedly as important to the successful inclusion and maintenance of individuals with severe disabilities in typical community and work settings (Bruininks, 1982; Gold, 1973; Gollay, Freedman, Wyngaarten, & Kurtz, 1978; Holman & Bruininks, 1985; McCarver & Craig, 1974; Wehman, 1975). If the goal of full inclusion in community and work life is to be realized for all people with disabilities, a greater degree of interdependence with people who did not have disabilities will be necessary (Lynch, 1989). Findings of the current study indicated that by being included in normalized environments (e.g., regular classes), many students with disabilities learn more appropriate social behaviors and acquire more desirable interpersonal characteristics. Both of these changes facilitate interactions with peers and can promote positive interdependence. Second, classmate responses indicated positive changes in classmate perspectives about peers with disabilities. Responses such as "they aren't always no fun" and "he can do a lot more than I thought he could" suggest that preconceived beliefs about peers with disabilities were altered positively.

Third, while classmates were positive about peers with disabilities being involved in regular classes, there was variability in classmate responses among classes. For example, all of the classmates (100%) in physical education A and social studies B responded that is was a good idea for a specific student with a disability to be in their respective classes, whereas only 73.91% and 75% of the classmates in physical education B and reading respectively thought inclusion of specific students was a good idea. These findings raise questions about the specific factors that might account of the variability. In this study, however, further analyses factoring out by type of class, grade level, degree of student disability (as defined by mental retardation label), and attendance provided little insight about possible explanations of the differences. Teacher characteristics and instructional format might be investigated in subsequent studies as potential factors. Two separate responses, one from the regular education reading teacher and one from the special education teacher whose students were in reading class, provide some insight as to a student factor that might account for differences in the attitudes of classmates about inclusion in regular classes:

> *"[student with moderate disabilities] did not have the social success I expected. I thought [student with severe disabilities] would have more trouble. Just the reverse happened." (special education teacher)*

> *"It's not intellect that is a measure of your success and whether or not people want to be around you. It's pleasantness." (reading teacher)*

Follow-up with these teachers to probe the subtleties of these responses resulted in the teachers identifying one of the students in reading class (the student with more severe disabilities) as more pleasant than the other integrated student. Behaviors of this particular student considered to contribute to his pleasantness were smiling, laughing, approaching classmates, emitting spontaneously his limited spoken vocabulary at times that classmates and the regular educator considered humorous (e.g., saying "bye" when a classmate was kicked out of class, and saying "ha-ha-ha" when asked a question or given other attention by the teacher). This finding again supports the research which indicates that social and interpersonal skills are one of the most important predictors of acceptance and therefore inclusion.

Another question raised by the results of this study addresses the issue of part-time (visitor status) versus full-time (membership status) participation or attendance in regular classes. Some believe full-time membership is necessary in order for students with disabilities to be accepted (Stainback, Stainback, & Forest, 1989; Vandercook, York, & Forest, in press). In this study, involvement of students with severe disabilities in the two social studies classes occurred approximately once each week. The students with severe disabilities attending these classes, therefore, might be considered visitors instead of members. The fact that all (100%) of the classmates in one of these social studies classes thought that inclusion of the specific peer with severe disabilities was a good idea leads one to question whether or not full-time membership is necessary for acceptance to be achieved. Gaining acceptance is likely a complex process influenced by a number of variables. In interviews with teachers and students without disabilities, authors of this paper learned that the student with severe disabilities who was integrated in social studies B is considered a "fun" student by classmates and teachers. Apparently, his classmates enjoyed being around him because he got excited about the activities they engaged in and liked to talk to his peers, even though his conversations were one-sided and redundant. This is not to suggest that membership is not an important guiding principle for inclusion in regular school life but that additional factors affect the degree of inclusion and acceptance.

There were relatively few classmate responses (only four of the 181 classmates) considered to reflect negatively on the regular class integration experiences. Further analysis of these, however, suggests that maladaptive or inappropriate social behaviors contributed to these negative perceptions. Responses such as: "she doesn't do the work" suggest negative value for a bad attitude/work ethic. Responses that a student was "hitting" and "swearing" indicate presence of unacceptable behavior.

Implications for Practice and Research

The findings of this study, in combination with the knowledge acquired in designing and implementing these specific regular class integration initiatives for middle school students with severe disabilities, provide the basis from which preliminary implications for practice and additional research are offered. There are numerous limitations to the study, however, and application of the results should be exercised with caution. Readers are reminded of the following limitations: (1) the middle schools were located in two suburban midwestern communities; (2) regular educators involved in the initial regular integration efforts were selected based on their reputations as being positive teachers and on their receptivity to the idea of including students with severe disabilities in their classes, at least on a trial basis; (3) although building, local district, and intermediate district administrators were not leading the regular class integration efforts, they were not in opposition to the efforts; (4) considerable external support was provided by university personnel in terms of providing information about and examples of why, where, and how students with severe disabilities have been integrated in other school communities, and providing ongoing technical assistance; and (5) quantifying and qualifying responses to the open-ended questionnaires involved a greater degree of subjective interpretation than if a more objective response format had been employed. Despite these limitations, this study does represent a preliminary attempt to both quantify and qualify some processes for and outcomes of integrating students with severe disabilities in middle school by soliciting information from teachers and students involved directly in the integration process. Specific implications for practice and research follow.

1. *Integrate students with severe disabilities in regular middle school classes.*

There are many advantages to integrating students with severe disabilities in regular middle school classes. First, there are a wide variety of regular class options in middle school. This

provides an opportunity for IEP teams to select the best options for individual students. Second, the school day of middle school students without disabilities is quite variable since students change learning environments (e.g., classes) every period. Designing an instructional day that takes place in a variety environments, including regular classes and off campus community environments, is consistent with the variety afforded students without disabilities. Third, by learning in the same environments, students with severe disabilities have the opportunity to watch and interact with peers instead of just with adults. Through these interactions, social and communication competencies can increase and positive interdependence can develop. Social competence and interdependence facilitate inclusion in current and future integrated environments. Fourth, because middle school classes change every period, regular educators may be less anxious about including a student with severe disabilities than if such students were to be included all day in the same class with the same regular educator as would occur in elementary schools.

2. *Assign students to regular classes based on chronological age.*

One of the major rationales behind the thrust to include students with disabilities in regular classes and other aspects of school life is the opportunity to develop relationships and to select friends, instead of adults matching peers before students ever meet and decide whether they even like one another. Developing relationships requires a certain degree of permanency, sharing common places and activities over extended periods of time. One disadvantage at middle school is the potential to have a different peer group every period of the day. This may work against the goal of students with disabilities getting "connected" with peers who do not have disabilities. By assigning students to regular classes by chronological age (e.g., by grade), the probability is increased that students with disabilities will become known as a member of a particular grade (e.g., a ninth grader) and that they will interact with some of the same peers in classes throughout the day. Also, because secondary programs have ways that regular education students are grouped together, it may be useful to learn how these groupings are formed in a particular school so that students with disabilities can be included in particular tracks. This could serve to increase the frequency with which students with disabilities have the opportunity to they interact with the same peers.

Taking a somewhat broader perspective, if young children with severe disabilities are integrated fully in elementary programs and than make the transition to secondary levels with relationships established (just as do students without disabilities), scheduling in middle school to provide regular opportunities for interaction with the same peers may be less of an issue for some students. For students just beginning to be included in regular classes and school life at the secondary level, however, special efforts to increase the frequency of interactions with some of the same peers in order to facilitate the formation of friendships may be necessary.

3. *Expand integration beyond nonacademic classes.*

The successful inclusion of students with severe disabilities in regular classes does not appear to be dependent primarily on the academic or non-academic nature of the curricular content area. The ways in which the classes are taught, including how all students are included in learning activities (e.g., cooperative learning), seem as important as the actual curricular area. There are many IEP objectives that reflect critical competencies, e.g., social and communication competencies, for participation across environments and activities. The major question is one of balance. For students to be included all day in classes in which curricular content is not directly relevant to life long functional competencies would be inappropriate. Conversely, exclusion based solely on perceived functional relevance of curricular content would be inappropriate also. During middle school years, involvement in classes perceived as nonfunctional in terms of curriculum might broaden the interests of students with disabilities just as for students without disabilities. For

example, one of the students with severe disabilities in the science class developed an interest in the earth science content area. This provided the IEP team with new information about interests which could be pursued in the leisure and vocational domains. Education for all students is about opportunity. If only for a small percentage of a student's day, involvement in varied curricular areas may be as appropriate for students with disabilities as for their classmates without labels.

4. *Recognize and promote classmate contributions.*

Most of the teachers indicated that the classmates were very accepting of the students with disabilities in their classes. Some mentioned considerable peer involvement with the students. Some classmates naturally interact and support students with disabilities. Others may be more reluctant until the teachers invite and model inclusion. In most of the classes, teachers felt that inclusion of a student with severe disabilities was a novel enough situation that classmates might benefit from an explanation of the important role of the classmates in integration; specifically, to give permission to and examples of how classmates might interact with and include the student with disabilities. Prior to the initial involvement of a student with severe disabilities in a regular class, the regular educator and/or special educator talked with classmates about why the student with severe disabilities would become a member of the class and encouraged their involvement with the student by providing specific examples of how students could participate together in class activities. Essentially, pre-existing classroom rules about helping each other learn and working together were expanded to include the new students also.

By using cooperative learning strategies, classmates learn to work as part of a group that shares a common goal (Johnson & Johnson, 1982). Positive interdependence for current and future community inclusion can develop. Initially, an adult may be used to model and promote inclusion. Sometimes a special education support person, called an integration facilitator, functions in that capacity. Use of such external support must be used cautiously and faded to the greatest extent possible so that dependence is not built upon the facilitator. In some cases, use of an additional adult to support a student with disabilities can actually inhibit inclusion (York, Vandercook, Caughey, & Heise-Neff, in press). A major purpose for adult involvement is to facilitate positive interdependence among the students.

5. *Communicate the expectations for and successes resulting from integration in regular classes.*

In the present study, the regular educators in particular indicated a need to understand the expectations for and benefits realized by the students with severe disabilities as a result of being included as members of regular classes. The reward of being a teacher is to know that students have learned. Knowing the learning opportunities available in regular classes and recognizing when learning has occurred are important if regular educators are to be enthusiastic participants who feel that they can and do contribute to the learning process. Learning opportunities in regular classes extend way beyond the curricular content area and include: (1) learning social and communication competencies to interact with peers, (2) learning behaviors required in many environments and activities (e.g., initiating, modeling, preparing, putting away), (3) learning life long functional and leisure skills (e.g., cooking, parenting, writing), and (4) developing interests that might otherwise go undiscovered (e.g., interest in earth science) (York, Vandercook, Caughey, Heise-Neff, in press).

Initially, special educators may need to identify for the regular educators the changes in the students with disabilities. Perhaps now that at these two middle schools the special educators involved in the integration are more confident in the positive outcomes resulting from regular class integration, they can communicate more clearly the expectations to regular educators on subsequent integration pursuits. Further, as regular educators begin to assume more ownership for students with severe disabilities and more confidence in teaching these students, they will be able to both

project expected outcomes and to identify positive growth and change in students with severe disabilities.

Another important aspect of communication among special and regular educators involves the collaborative team process for designing and implementing quality, integrated educational programs. The IEP process for assessment, identifying goals and objectives, and developing instructional programs must be establishing, along with teamwork logistics for collaborative planning and problem solving. As regular class integration initiatives continue, more efficient team operations will develop. (See Macdonald and York, 1989 for a discussion of instructional programming for students with severe disabilities in regular classes.)

6. *In initial integration efforts, select teachers willing to be involved.*

Although inclusion in regular classes and other aspects of regular school life must not be considered optional for students with severe disabilities, a large part of what makes that inclusion successful is the adults involved in the process. Regular class integration of students with severe disabilities is a new practice for most regular and special educators and requires the acquisition of new skills and strategies. Effective strategies will be developed most efficiently when the most talented and positive personnel resources are utilized. These individuals can develop and implement effective strategies for integrating the students and for expanding efforts to include more students and teachers.

7. *Promote teamwork among regular and special education staff.*

Participation by both regular and special education staff is necessary for the integration of students with severe disabilities in regular classes to be successful. In a system that generally promotes working in isolation, the teamwork required to successfully include all children in regular classes provides regular and special education teachers with the opportunity to support one another and to expand their curricular and instructional expertise to better meet the needs of all children. Feeling supported in one's work place and having the opportunity to work and interact with others who share the common goal of quality education for all students, promotes community for the adults in schools also.

In promoting effective teamwork, special education support staff (e.g., therapists) and paraprofessionals in addition to regular and special education teachers must continue to be involved. Physical therapists and occupational therapists, for example, can identify challenges presented in regular classes due to motoric difficulties and then assist in designing intervention strategies to promote more inclusion. Communication specialists can determine social and communication demands and opportunities in regular education classes and design interventions accordingly. Paraprofessionals frequently are the individuals who provide support in regular classes, they must be included, supported, and valued as team members. Because the need to provide personal support to the student with disabilities in a regular class is likely to decrease as the student becomes more included in the class activities and routines, the in-class support person must be reinforced for fading his or her presence from the student with disabilities while simultaneously being provided with a meaningful role, e.g., serving as support to all children in the class. Making appropriate decisions about when and how to provide support and facilitate inclusion requires teamwork and support.

8. *Document, evaluate, and disseminate examples of how students with severe disabilities are included in a wide variety of regular classes.*

Both the regular and special educators identified determining how to include students with severe disabilities into regular class activities as the most difficult aspect of the integration. Both groups also indicated having learned how to do this more effectively by the end of the integration experience. By documenting, evaluating, and disseminating examples of how individual students with severe disabilities can be included in productive and meaningful ways in regular classes, the transition to regular class integration might be made easier for further efforts and other educators initiating the change to regular class integration.

9. *Promote permanency as a basis for program and systems design.*

Much of the success of integration and developing inclusive school communities depends upon relationships among teachers and among students. . .at least until top-down, systemic adoption of and commitment to full integration occurs. Change in program and systems designs requires that people learn to work together. Working together is facilitated by establishing rapport and trust. Unfortunately, the design of many special education systems does not promote permanency or inclusion in regular school communities and, therefore, inhibits the development of interpersonal relationships upon which rapport and trust are built. Relationships are the essence of inclusive communities. Frequent relocation of special education students and teachers to different buildings and districts works against their inclusion, not only in their immediate school communities but in the general community as well. Systems design that results in children with disabilities attending the school they would attend if not labeled, i.e., their home/neighborhood school, promotes permanency and inclusion.

10. *Conduct both quantitative and qualitative research that promotes knowledge regarding ways in which students with severe disabilities can be included successfully in regular classes and other aspects of regular school life.*

Increasingly, integration of students with disabilities in mainstreamed school and community life is promoted as a value based on beliefs about where people with disabilities should spend their time, i.e., in the same wide array of integrated environments in which all people have the opportunity to spend their time. This is evidenced in the professional literature as well as in mission statements of individual school districts. Most would agree that the goal of a public school education for all children, including those with severe disabilities, is preparation for adult life in the community. The charge of researchers and educators, therefore, is to work collaboratively to determine the ways in which this goal can be realized. Research should address ways to make integration work...not to determine whether it is a good idea (Biklen, Lehr, Searl, & Taylor, 1987; Haring & Breen, in press; Stainback & Stainback, in press). Specific areas of research might be to: (1) identify critical teacher variables, including instructional style and format, that facilitate interaction in regular activities (e.g., reinforcement of cooperative learning, inclusion in class discussions, assigning valued roles and responsibilities, emphasis on accomplishment, recognition of unique contributions); (2) determine supports that promote integration (e.g., planning and preparation, scheduling opportunities for collaborative teamwork between regular and special educators, judicious use of an integration facilitator); (3) identify characteristics of students that facilitate interaction with classmates (e.g., "pleasantness," interest in classmates and activities, humor and enjoyment); (4) determine guidelines for achieving an individually determined balance between instruction in regular school and community environments, (5) design strategies and adaptations so that students with severe disabilities can be included in appropriate ways in regular class activities, (6) study the variables involved in relationship formation between students with severe disabilities and peers without identified disabilities, (7) investigate ways in which regular and special education resources can be

used more efficiently to better meet the needs of all children, (8) design, implement, and evaluate change models that support adult professionals in learning new roles and performance expectations, and (9) analyze current policy and procedures that work against the development of integrated school communities and recommend changes needed.

CONCLUSION

Integration of students with severe disabilities into regular education middle school classes was perceived positively by all of the regular and special educators and by the vast majority of the classmates involved. Educators and classmates are integral to the success of integration and their perspectives and recommendations are essential to the development of quality educational programs in typical school settings. Perhaps most significant from the findings of this study were the benefits realized by educators and by students and the recommendations for continued regular class integration efforts. Clearly, additional demonstrations and research efforts are needed to address in greater detail and with greater control the variables critical for success. In these efforts, attention must be paid to strategies effective in changing the behavior and subsequently the attitudes of both the adults and children involved in developing more inclusive school communities.

REFERENCES

Berman, P. (1981). Educational change, an implementation paradigm. In R. Lehming & M. Kane, (Eds.), Improving schools, using what we know. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Biklen, D. (1985). Achieving the complete school: Strategies for effective mainstreaming. New York: Teachers College Press.

Biklen, D., Lehr, S., Searl, S. J., & Taylor, S. J. (1987). Purposeful integration. . .inherently equal. Boston: Technical Assistance for Parent Programs (TAPP) Project.

Bruininks, R. H. (1982). Deinstitutionalization of the handicapped. In H. Mitzel, J. Best, W. Rabinowitz, & A. Landy (Eds.), Encyclopedia of educational research (5th ed.). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Davis, W. E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55(5), 440-446.

Elias, L. (1986). Jason goes to first grade. The Exceptional Parent, 16(5), 12-13.

Ford, A., & Davern, L. (1989). Moving forward with school integration: Strategies for involving students with severe handicaps in the life of the school. In R. Gaylord-Ross (Ed.), Integration strategies for persons with handicaps. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Forest, M. (1986). Sabrina and Adrian. Entourage, 1(1), 111-115.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review, 57(4), 367-395.

Giangreco, M. F., & Meyer, L. H. (1988). Expanding service delivery options in regular schools and classrooms for students with severe disabilities. In J. L. Graden, J. E. Zins, & M. J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students (pp. 241-268). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Gold, M. W. (1973). Vocational habilitation for the mentally retarded. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation, (vol. 6) (pp. 97-147). New York: Academic Press.

Gollay, E., Freedman, R., Wyngaarten, M., & Kurtz, N. R. (1978). Coming back: The community experiences of deinstitutionalized mentally retarded people. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books.

Goodman, P., & Dean, J. (1982). Creating long-term organizational change. In Goodman and Associates (Eds.), Change in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hanline, M. F., & Halvorsen, A. (1989). Parent perceptions of the integration transition process: Overcoming artificial barriers. Exceptional Children, 55(6), 487-492.

Haring, T. G., & Breen, C. (in press). Units of analyses of social interaction outcomes in supported education. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Holman, J. E., & Bruininks, R. H. (1985). Assessing and training adaptive behaviors. In K. C. Lakin & R. H. Bruininks (Eds.), Strategies for achieving community integration of developmentally disabled citizens, (pp. 73-104). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, F. P. (1982). Joining together: Group therapy and group skills (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kaufman, J. M., Gerber, M. M., & Semmel, M. I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(1), 6-11.

Lieberman, L. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? Exceptional Children, 51, 513-516.

Lilly, M. S. (1988). The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 23, 253-260.

Louis, K. (1986). Permanent innovations: Theoretical and administrative issues in institutionalizing educational change. In J. Voogt & A. Reints (Eds.), Naar beter onderwijis (Toward Better Education). Tilburg: Zwijsen.

Lynch, B. (1989, March). Barriers to community. ARC News for Colorado. Denver: Association for Retarded Citizens.

McCarver, R., & Craig, E. (1974). Placement of the retarded in the community: Prognosis and outcome. In N. R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press.

Messinger, J. (1985). Commentary on "A rationale for the merger of special and regular education" or is it now time for the lamb to lie down with the lion? Exceptional Children, 51, 510-512.

Reynolds, M. C., Wang, C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 53, 391-398.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (in press). Using qualitative data collection procedures to investigate supported education issues. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Stainback, W., Stainback, S. & Forest, M. (Eds.). (1989). Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Strully, J., & Strully, C. (1985). Friendship and our children. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 10, 224-227.

Thousand, J. S., Fox, T. J., Reid, R., Godek, J., Williams, W., & Fox, W. L. (1986). The Homecoming Model: Educating students who present intensive educational challenges within regular education environments. Burlington: University of Vermont, Center for Developmental Disabilities.

Vandercook, T., York, J., & Forest, M. (in press). MAPS: A strategy for building the vision. Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Vergason, G. A., & Anderegg, M. L. (1989). An answer to: The regular education initiative: A force for change in general and special education. Education and Training in Mental Retardation, 24(1), 100-101.

Wehman, P. (1975). Toward a social skills curriculum for developmentally disabled clients in vocational settings. Rehabilitation Literature, 11, 342-348.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-416.

York, J., Thurlow, M., & Vandercook, T. (1988). Feedback from middle school students about activities with peers who have severe disabilities. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Affiliated Program on Developmental Disabilities.

York, J., & Vandercook, T. (1989). Strategies for achieving an integrated education for middle school learners with severe disabilities. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Institute on Community Integration.

York, J., Vandercook, T., Caughey, E., Heise-Neff, C. (in press). Does an "integration facilitator" facilitate integration? TASH Newsletter. Seattle: The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

York J., Vandercook, T., Caughey, E., & Heise-Neff, C. (in press). Regular class integration: Beyond socialization. TASH Newsletter. Seattle: The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps.

Zeph, L. A. (1988, April). Broadening the discussion of the regular education initiative to include students with severe handicaps (deleting the asterisks and footnotes). Paper presented at the 67th annual conference of the Council for Exceptional Children, San Francisco, CA.

APPENDIX A:

Regular Class Integration Feedback Questionnaire Protocols

FEEDBACK FROM REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS

ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. Why did you agree to having learners with severe disabilities become members of regular education classes?

2. Describe how the learners with severe disabilities participated in the regular class (e.g., activities, adaptations, seating, involvement with peers, involvement with teacher, supports, etc.).

3. What was the most difficult aspect of this experience?

4. What was the best or most interesting aspect of this experience?

5. What outcomes or changes (positive and/or negative) have resulted from this experience?

   a. For regular education teacher?

   b. For special education teacher?

   c. For regular education learners?

   d. For special education learners?

6. Have there been any effects or changes that occurred beyond class time?

7. What recommendations do you have for expanding integration efforts to include more learners and faculty so that integration becomes a greater focus for the whole school?

8. If you were asked to talk with other schools initiating the movement toward integrating learners with severe disabilities into regular classes, what would you tell them? How would you recommend that they proceed?

FEEDBACK FROM SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. Why did you agree to having learners with severe disabilities become members of regular education classes?

2. Describe how the learners with severe disabilities participated in the regular class (e.g., activities, adaptations, seating, involvement with peers, involvement with teacher, supports, etc.).

3. What was the most difficult aspect of this experience?

4. What was the best or most interesting aspect of this experience?

5. What outcomes or changes (positive and/or negative) have resulted from this experience?

   a. For regular education teacher?

   b. For special education teacher?

   c. For regular education learners?

   d. For special education learners?

6. Have there been any effects or changes that occurred beyond class time?

7. What recommendations do you have for expanding integration efforts to include more learners and faculty so that integration becomes a greater focus for the whole school?

8. If you were asked to talk with other schools initiating the movement toward integrating learners with severe disabilities into regular classes, what would you tell them? How would you recommend that they proceed?

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. Do you think it's good for Jenny and Gwen to attend regular classes, like your social studies class? Yes or no?

2. What changes in Jenny and Gwen have you noticed since they started attending your social studies class?

   Jenny:

   Gwen:

3. What have you learned by having Jenny and Gwen in your health class?

4. Can you think of other classes, or after school activities, or during school activities that Jenny and Gwen could be more involved in?

   Other classes:

   In-school activities:

   After-school activities:

   Community activities:

THANKS FOR HELPING US OUT BY ANSWERING THESE QUESTIONS!

APPENDIX B:

Regular Educators Response Summaries

FEEDBACK FROM REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHERS

ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. WHY DID YOU AGREE TO HAVING LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES BECOME MEMBERS OF YOUR CLASS?

(SC) 1) Interest in all kids with whatever limitations they may have.
2) The challenge of a new involvement for me and the members of the class.
3) What I saw in leadership in this program (Mike and others).

(IT) I think it's a professional responsibility that every teacher feels, that is to take any student at any level and try to help them. If it doesn't work, then I might think twice the second time.

(PE) To see if these students could fit into a regular PE class. To help out the new program and not be closed minded.

(HR) To have my students understand other kids handicaps and see beyond themselves.

(HL) My interest in my class learning to associate with children with disabilities. The positive impact I have received as the parent of a TMR teenager from limited mainstreaming.

(PE) I felt it would be a good learning experience for students and teacher!

(SS) So they would become socialized with other students their age.

(ART) I don't know.

(RD) I like to try new adventures. It keeps my 33 year career exciting.

(PE) J is the student in my class and she is not severely disabled.

(HR) So that my students (and myself) will learn something about other people that have disabilities.

2. DESCRIBE HOW THE LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES PARTICIPATED IN YOUR CLASS (E.G., ACTIVITIES, ADAPTATIONS, SEATING, INVOLVEMENT WITH PEERS, INVOLVEMENT WITH TEACHER, SUPPORTS, ETC.).

(SC) participation - as much as possible the same as other students.
adaptation - haven't really done anything or feel I have known what to do.
seating - they sit where they want and move if they like other students.
peer involvement - indirectly at least with all members of class. Several students considerable daily involvement.
teacher involvement - varied also - some days little or no, other days more.

(IT) C's ability to participate was very limited. He was able to move things from place to place, like moving boards from one process station to another. He also tried to help put tools away.

(PE) 6th grade - 1st basketball skills including shooting, dribbling, etc. 2nd grade swimming practicing front and back crawls. 3rd grade tumbling skills including front and back somersaults.

(HR) Home room only. One learner had his sister help him with basic reading activities.

(HL) A volunteer on a one-to-one helped the student they were responsible for sitting next to them. They obtained necessary drawing paper, markers, etc.

(PE) They would participate the same as the rest of the group except in certain activities we would have to modify the program, for example, basketball - more individual drills rather than group drills.

(SS) I felt having them the entire hour was counter-productive for them. Most of what I do in my social studies classes involves reading and writing, which left the "special" nippers out in the cold. Because of this, I don't think they ever felt part of the group.

(ART) Most were very involved. Kids in class seemed willing to help. M was very social as well as involved. One girl worked but was rather withdrawn. M earned additional respect for his arm wrestling ability.

(RD) We have materials from grades 1-12 so some of the students were treated normally but with a buddy helper. In D's case, B prepared most of the materials. Some days, like game days, he participated to his level.

(PE) J did all activities that other students participated in. They did have some writing activities which J was unable to do such as on a team in team handball and partner for badminton and ping pong tournament (her partner did all the scoring, etc.).

(HR) Two children are in Homeroom and S.Q.U.I.R.T. (Reading). Class is quiet, except for last minutes. Students talk at end of time - seating is integrated so the new students are near the other 8th graders.

3. WHAT WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT ASPECT OF THIS EXPERIENCE?

(SC) Really none other than I haven't felt like I have really contributed much to them in class.

(IT) For me as a teacher there was little difficulty as M took charge of helping C fit into our different activities.

(PE) Keeping an eye on my regular calls plus the new students. Knowing what to expect from the various skill level and how to fit them into a class and not take anything away from the regular class.

(HR) Really no problems.

(HL) Trying to make sure the daily lesson was something the students could participate in.

(PE) Not able to spend enough individual time with student. Legal liability.

(SS) The realization that I couldn't plan activities for my "average" nippers that would make sense to the special kids.

(ART) I do not know how to respond to these kids. Their presence in class seemed to be odd. I kind of rolled with it. Asked a few questions, tried to help, and let them do their thing. I tried to get them into my better classes or smaller classes, too many kids are too many no matter what their abilities are.

(RD) D's extreme handicap.

(PE) In tennis, J needed more help then I was able to give her.

(HR) Treating the students like I do my other students. They <u>also</u> have to obey the class rules.

4. WHAT WAS THE BEST OR MOST INTERESTING ASPECT OF THIS EXPERIENCE?

(SC) 1) To see the kids that have chosen to interact and work with them in class.
2) To see how in certain situations the whole class dealt with them when I included them in an activity or whatever. All was very positive and supportive.
3) To see the genuine concern and acceptance of the kids in class to J and J.
4) To know that J and J are seen as a very real part of the class.
5) To see how my students have perceived what J and J can do and they have continued to motivate them to continue doing it. Example: J turning lights out for movie, etc.

(IT) I think seeing the other students reactions to C was the most interesting.

(PE) The seemed to get along real well. Regular class seemed to accept them.

(HR) My students "accepting" them.

(HL) The smiles on their faces and their desire to keep coming every day. The acceptance by the students in my health class of the 916 students.

(PE) The acceptance and concern from the students in class.

(SS) I have now had two "special" kids in my home room which works better as it only lasts 20-30 minutes. These "special" kids seem to feel more of a part of the group here, than in my regular classes.

(ART) That the students (coming into my class) got enjoyment from their work.

(RD) How the students accepted them and cared for them. How the girls wanted the challenge to work with D.

(PE) In badminton and ping pong, J did well and it was great to see her enjoyment. The rest of the students paid very little attention to J which in this circumstance was a positive reaction.

In tennis, J is having difficulty and it is not easy to give her the help she needs. Tennis is a difficult area and so my helping time is spread among many students. In this unit it is necessary to have another teacher to assist J.

(HR) My students' reaction to and acceptance of the disabled kids.

5. WHAT OUTCOMES OR CHANGES (POSITIVE AND/OR NEGATIVE) HAVE RESULTED FROM THIS EXPERIENCE?

A. FOR REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER?

(SC) Nothing. Just wished I could do more for these guys. (See #6 below)

(IT) I don't feel changed much. I didn't notice change in C, but M could see a change so it seemed good for C to be there. Therefore there was some reward for me.

(PE) Worry about liability.

(HR) To tell the truth, M and I have travelled the world and seen extremely unfortunate situations, physically and mentally.

(HL) Assurance that social advantages of mainstreaming far out weigh any concerns.

(PE) A very positive experience. Enjoyed seeing the response from the rest of the class (feelings of concern).

(SS) No comments.

(ART) I don't know.

(RD) I am ready to have those who are about 1st grade or better in the class anytime. The more sever like D I haven't decided.

(PE) No comments.

(HR) I will <u>have</u> students in my homeroom next year. I will send average students to work during the day.

B. FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER?

(SC and IT no comments).

(PE) Not knowing what to do or regular teacher not telling me what to do.

(HR) Being welcomed into the John Glenn environment, hopefully.

(HL) No comments.

(PE) No comments.

(SS) No comments.

(ART) A chance to see their student function in the regular class and see or be involved with or "normal" group.

(RD) No comments.

(PE) No comments.

C. FOR REGULAR EDUCATION LEARNERS?

(SC) I have gained some insights and feelings for these guys and how positive the class has responded as well.

(IT) They possibly gained some understanding and tolerance of others that may be different from themselves.

(PE) Not knowing what to do to help out or how to react to their actions.

(HR) Acceptance, absolutely no harassing or teasing.

(HL) To discover that these students have same needs they have.

(PE) Developed a good understanding of the problems a student has with disabilities.

(SS) No comments.

(ART) Maybe by osmosis realize that they are fortunate. Some find others limitations as a chance for them to rise in the pecking order.

(RD) They learned to help and care for them. Better persons for it.

(PE) Tolerance and more patience by those who worked with J. The realization that she is able to do much of what they are able to do and sometimes better than some.

D. FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION LEARNERS?

(SC) No comments.

(IT) No comments.

(PE) Being with regular class, not being special (special to be in this class).

(HR) Hopefully, becoming part of the group.

(HL) To feel accepted.

(PE) No comments.

(SS) No comments.

(ART) Art is a vehicle that is many things to many people, it's therapy, it's visualization, it's reading, it's ahas, it's fulfillment of expression. For these kids I'm sure it is some of those things also.

(RD) No comments.

(PE) No comments.

6. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY EFFECTS OR CHANGES THAT OCCURRED BEYOND CLASS TIME?

(SC) Relationships with these guys out of class and others as well. Have really appreciated all of the opportunities to work with and get to just know as persons - the staff I've worked with.

(IT) Not to my knowledge.

(PE) None.

(HR) Acceptance, I believe, in the hallways and classrooms.

(HL) Greeting myself in halls and lunch room.

(PE) No comments.

(SS) No comments.

(ART) Not that I know about.

(RD) P and K have been like friends to me.

(PE) Recognition of J in halls and positive communication.

7. WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR EXPANDING INTEGRATION EFFORTS TO INCLUDE MORE LEARNERS AND FACULTY SO THAT INTEGRATION BECOMES A GREATER FOCUS FOR THE WHOLE SCHOOL?

(SC) Continued communication and cooperation of the staff that you have with our staff. One year isn't enough either. Let's give it better shot - next year too and whatever.

(IT) None.

(PE) Working between teacher and special ed teachers. But so many of our PE staff have been around sooooo long they do not like change and this happens with these kids. Special ed PE teachers try not to be on outside looking in. We need to work on this, too. Also HOW MUCH PE do these kids need their class, our class, etc. Conform to our ways, rules, locker procedures, etc.

(HR) More home rooms for sure. Question marks remain on total involvement into academic classes, maybe on certain selected days where the work is appropriate or parts of certain days or hours.

(HL) A presentation to the staff by those who have experienced mainstreaming and asking for volunteers to try it.

(PE) I would certainly recommend going forward with the program.

(SS) No comments.

(ART) I am not a real supporter of most mainstreaming. I do it, most of the time it works in my area to some degree, but much recent literature does not support mainstreaming. I am in a strange position. I have to do what I don't believe in but it kind of works because it is art. Art has versatility and strength, so I am in a dichotomous situation when it comes to recommending. I guess I would do it again, short periods, certain situations. (The mainstreaming articles were not about severely impaired, more EBD, etc., etc.)

(RD) Go slow, pick staff carefully, share positives, look for subjects where the success can come.

(PE) integration in classes where the students can function. If J had been unable to do the activities reasonably well, the team would not have reacted well and I would have had difficulty finding a partner at tournament time. Regular class time practice is not a problem.

8. IF YOU WERE ASKED TO TALK WITH OTHER SCHOOLS INITIATING THE MOVEMENT TOWARD INTEGRATING LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES INTO REGULAR CLASSES, WHAT WOULD YOU TELL THEM? HOW WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THAT THEY PROCEED?

(SC) 1) It's great.
2) Has to have good cooperation with both staffs.
3) Start out for sure on voluntary basis.
4) Communication between 2 staffs - especially the 2 learners working together.
5) How do we really know until we try?

(IT) I guess my advice would be to learn more about the level of accomplishment that a special education student can hope to have. In education we must find it rewarding to share in the students accomplishments and it was difficult for me to find rewards in working with C because things changed so slowly and the progress was so minute in comparison with other regular education students.

(PE) Certain classes yes, but the majority of our subjects, no. Better understanding of what is expected of all concerned, both staffs, students, and administration knowing all aspects.

(HR) See answer to question #7.

(HL) I have done this at South Campus.

(PE) Select a good class, a smaller class. Have a teaching assistant with you if possible. Prepare your class ahead of time.

(SS) I question whether it's a viable effort in the academic classes, especially in the higher grades (i.e., I find it difficult to integrate the "special" kids in a discussion of the separation of power doctrine and the 3 branches of our federal government).

(ART) I don't know.

(RD) Must be volunteers. Match teacher from both programs. Be open in communicating. Try different ideas, projects, and techniques and expect some failures.

(PE) Good communication about the capabilities and expectations prior to entry into class. Have a flexible system of movement in and out of an area.

APPENDIX C:

Special Educators Response Summaries

FEEDBACK FROM SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. WHY DID YOU AGREE TO HAVING LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES BECOME MEMBERS OF REGULAR EDUCATION CLASSES?

(A) An opportunity to observe students in a different environment (peers, teachers, materials) and their response. The experience of a school as a community. Creativity of staff in adapting materials. Opportunity to team with regular education teachers. Opportunity to get to know regular education students.

(B) Needed some answers - personally and professionally. Wanted the experience to know more about it - mostly for me. (I found out the answers.)

(C)
- Excited - if you don't try it, you won't know.
- Concerned about what might happen (behaviors).
- Wondered if behaviors would change - if kids would act more appropriately with regular education peers.
- Knew D was social and thought he might make some friends.
- Thought D might be a problem - running, not staying on task, loud, disruptive to rest of class.
- Would have tried any class.
- At first concerned about reading class because D does not read. Wanted to be sure could use class functionally. Then looked at reading as communication building. Time to work on using pictures for schedules, shopping, communication boards. Had IEP objectives related to picture grocery lists and communication boards.
- Chance to show regular education folks that regular class integration could work - not just dumping. Counteract history of dumping with more mildly handicapped.

(D) I think it's important for NH students to become familiar with handicapped or disabled students in their classes so they get to know the kids as individuals. Also, it has become apparent that the differences or disabilities of the handicapped kids are minimized.

(E) Students with severe disabilities need to become involved in range of experiences so that they will generalize learning across environments. Students need to develop their social skills repertoire and non-handicapped peers can serve as excellent models.

(F) I felt it would be as excellent opportunity for my students to meet and participate with other non-handicapped students in a typical regular education classroom.

(G) Students need experience with normal students.

2. DESCRIBE HOW THE LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES PARTICIPATED IN THE REGULAR CLASS (E.G., ACTIVITIES, ADAPTATIONS, SEATING, INVOLVEMENT WITH PEERS, INVOLVEMENT WITH TEACHER, SUPPORTS, ETC.).

(A) Activities - fairly easy to adapt a focus was on reading so therefore worked on meaningful word recognition news papers, building signs etc., reports, games - building in assistance. Seating they sat where they wanted: boys with boys - girls with girls. Involvement with peers - social greetings small talk family related (if our students would relate experiences they were interested and asked questions). Involvement with teachers - similar to peers - occurred when necessary. Supports. Shared Teacher/Assistant.

(B)
- Jn has had the most interactions. He communicates back to peers. Jk sends messages about being alone - he likes to be alone.
- Jk will attend to Mr. B because he is entertaining, not because of content. Jk has more difficulty taking things in visually. Surprised Jk didn't like more things (ex., inflatable planetarium). He went right in but didn't look. Jk needs to be in a more interactive class - more groups projects on a daily basis.
- Jn "marvels" at science. He is real interested - especially in filmstrips and movies. Enjoys content (i.e., moon, sunspots). Jn was cautious with planetarium. He got looks of peer encouragement. When he finally went in, he looked up and said "stars."
- Jn more involved with peers. He is more responsive, quick. He also learned a lot of science content.

(C)
- D and R at very beginning in classroom, listen to directions (D & R have assigned seats). R finds seat independently. T sends D in and regular peer helps. T asks peer "would you see that Dave gets in his desk?"
- D really good for grocery and schedule pictures not as good with communication board.
- Then Reg T directs someone to work with D and with R from list of volunteers. Selects based on who kept up with work. Once in awhile someone new wants to help. About four. Changed helper every 15 minutes.
- Bring supplies from special education room. Leave on table.

D:
- D outside in library for space reasons for part of period. Head back in before end of hour with peer. About 5 minutes of free time. Putting books away, talking. D usually in desk. Sometimes talking with people. Many peers say "Hi."
- Schedule opens up conversation. Teaches peers about D and his day at school. Facilitates communication with signing when points to "walk" on communication system.
- Goes through past day. Schedule is written out for next day. D and peer go through pictures can find some pictures by word label. Each have own pile. Peer does most finding.

R:
- Beginning and end of class are same for R. Checks with Regular T about assignment for the day. Goes out with peer. Regular T does planning for R.

D:
• mostly B plans - beginning some planning together with regular education T. He took pictures to see if he can work with them.
• Last game day played "Wheel of Fortune" wrote letters on cards - D picked from small away of cards with letters.
• Fridays - game day. Thursday - free read.

(D) Buddied the kids up in Health, some PE classes, and some Homerooms.

(E) The regular teacher paired the handicapped student with a non-handicapped peer for work sheet activity. He had to learn to raise his hand, and not speak out, prior to being called upon by the instructor. There was time at the end of each class for socialization with peers. Teacher need to learn to follow through or requests made of the severely disabled students as he did with non-disabled students.

(F) Students participated in homeroom and quiet reading. They were responsible for acquiring books from the library and bringing to homeroom their own reading materials. Announcements were listened to and information relayed to us. Greetings to peers and teachers were given and received. Quiet reading was then done.

(G) We're involved in mainly group activities. No individual work.

3. WHAT WAS THE MOST DIFFICULT ASPECT OF THIS EXPERIENCE?

(A) Challenge to create a variety of age appropriate materials.

(B) • How to support J and J to increase involvement in subject matter. Who supports? How to get peers more involved? Peer support is inconsistent.
• Scheduling/logistics: if an a.m. and p.m. class, when to do community instruction?
• Get out of it what put into it. It takes time.
• Speed of special education S. The world doesn't always wait.

(C) • Beginning . . . what do when get there? Still confusing how regular class itself works - actual assignments. Makes it harder to help other kids. Would like to increase work with other kids.
• Preparation easier now that know what doing - initially 30-60 minutes per day - now just one hour per week.

(D) Ongoing communication - evaluating the experience and deciding what the next move will be (i.e., adaptations, objectives) -- only because it was thought provoking, a challenge. Not terribly difficult.

(E) The inconsistency of participation in social studies class; change/progress can only come over time.

(F) The most difficult was scheduling staff to participate and support as needed in the rooms.

(G) Getting teachers involved.

4. WHAT WAS THE BEST OR MOST INTERESTING ASPECT OF THIS EXPERIENCE?

(A) Acceptance of students to us teachers Kelly, Peg to their class - we're a part of it. Regular Education T was out one day, had sub all classes were awful (sub wrote a note and had to have the principal come to help). Our class was great - No problem! Interacting/Planning with teacher. Learning from each other. Acceptance of students.

(B)
- Seeing students in such a different environment - really eye opening. If we build a wall around them to be in special environments how do T or S learn about typical situations and expectations. Instructors are supposed to be building better middle school kids more age appropriate behavior - they need to set out and learn about middle school.
- Know more about science and how kids can be involved. You can't read (learn) this in a book. You must experience it. Special education T must develop some body of knowledge in class content areas. You feel like a student, so supposed to be cooperating to teach, need to know re: intent otherwise kids stop asking questions.

(C)
- To watch D in class. He is no worse than the rest of the kids. He listens and sometimes will do things that Regular Education T is doing, e.g., point. D knows routines so when peer is assigned by Regular Education T, D automatically gets up.
- R didn't have the social success I expected. Thought D would have had more trouble. Just reverse. D was more accepted. R less so. R alienates people by not talking with. (R is labeled EMR. D is labeled SMR).
- Anecdotes. When one kid kicked out of class, D said, "Bye."
- Anecdote: Sent up some kids to work in career center on computer. Regular Education T asked who wanted to go all raised hands.
- Anecdote: Regular Education T said "it's not intellect that is a measure of success and whether or not people want to be around you, it's pleasantness."

(D) Learning about the reactions, or "lack of" reaction to having our kids in their classes and the observations I mentioned above.

(E) 1. The experience allowed me to see how a severely disabled learner can learn similar skills in an integrated environment which previously I felt could not be worked on with the successes seen in the special education classes. (Generalization across environment of skills plus the socialization.)
2. Skills and behavior often reinforced in the special education classrooms are often inappropriate in the regular classroom (e.g., talking, hugging).

(F) The best aspect of this experience was the friendships that developed.

(G) Students were accepted without any problems.

5. WHAT OUTCOMES OR CHANGES (POSITIVE AND/OR NEGATIVE) HAVE RESULTED FROM THIS EXPERIENCE?

A. FOR REGULAR EDUCATION TEACHER?

(A) Regular Education teacher - knowledge of special Education students - "a vision developing"

(B)
- Hopefully less anxious about integration and support.
- Use of new strategies for "typical" kids who are slipping through the cracks.
- More involved in problem solving and planning related to special education S.
- New colleagues and friends.

(C) Getting a lot of strokes. Appreciates when say thank you. Always willing to talk to folks. Thank you notes. Feels good about what doing so is willing to talk to others. (For some regular education T, it may be hard to have someone else around in class.)

(D) Some surprises due to their student reactions.

(E) The experience has begun to desensitize him to have a student with severe disabilities in this class. Increased his willingness/motivation to become more involved in the future with integration.

(F) Positive that our students would participate appropriately and could and would follow some social/behavior expectations.

(G) Aware that our students can handle regular classes.

B. FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER?

(A) Special Education teacher - a whole new perspective on education. not so localized to special learner. Expectations are more age appropriate on regular education class. Less adult permission requested in regular education environments than in special education environment..

(B)
- More a part of building, staff, the school community.
- Wealth of new information about special and regular students.
- With every different (special education) learner in science, I learn more about science and how it might work for others.
- New colleagues and friends.

(C) More convinced that want to appropriately integrate kids. Now confident that it's good for both special and regular peers.

(D) Outcomes, changes in their kids.

(E) Made me more aware of need to understand regular education curriculum for adaptations and the role of generalized learning across environments/people.

(F) Positive - that the time commitment involved in integrating gave me the opportunity to listen to the concerns and ideas of the involved teachers.

C. FOR REGULAR EDUCATION LEARNERS?

(A) Regular Education learner - They have no problems with our students being there.

(B)
- Erases stereotypes about high needs S.
- Shows them how hard some kids must work to learn new stuff.

(C)
- Much more comfortable, e.g., accommodated to being touched by D.
- Generated protectiveness for D.
- Adjust to "rude" things, tolerance.
- Self-esteem (B strove to do better so he could work with D) "Tolerance."

Regular Education T feels it's important that all benefit. It's a two way street. B's (regular education student) grades improved. Regular Education student support

person told Regular Education T how good it was for A's self esteem. She is dressing better.

(D) Learned that handicapped peers weren't as different as they thought, that they could be friends, do many of the same activities that they do. Also, that a non-verbal student can communicate.

(E) Along with desensitizing them to a student in their class with severe disabilities many of the learners picked up on the strategies the special education staff sought to achieve from having a student in their class.

(F) Realization that physical and/or mental differences in our students was only one aspect of that person - that our students were more alike then they are different from them.

(G) That these kids are okay.

D. FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION LEARNERS?

(A) Special Education learner - Highlight of their school days.

(B)
- They can't go any place in school without kids talking to them (no negative comments).
- JK: more part of school community. Likes other adults around.
- Jn: experienced it all: materials, peers. He was freed up from caregiver. Increased his skills and knowledge in the subject area (science).

C:
- Accomplished IEP mobility goals re: ramps and elevator buttons.
- Beginning to initiate more reaching out to explore.
- Learning to transport things in his lap and put things away. Before just hoped he wouldn't throw it.
- More initiation of wheeling around, exploring. Uses different routes to get same places.
- Feeling more safe, comfortable.
- Lab group has gotten close, tight. Still not real spontaneous with C but beginning to be more receptive about involvement. Major difficulty is time it takes for C to be involved and peers have timelines to complete projects.
- less rocking, more watching.

(C) Learning to interact with peers not just adults. Around peers who can interact and are more socially competent. Always some amount of down time in special education class. At least when in regular class "down time" still provides opportunities to learn and interact.

Social Outcomes:
- R had more problems (she is more mildly handicapped).
- D is making friends. He approaches kids he knows. He is more directed than his usual wandering. D is still doing some undesirable behaviors - initially less but now that he is more comfortable they (behaviors) are coming back, e.g., sucking on shirt.
- R is working on saying "Hi." Feedback from peers showed they are taking shy behavior as snobbish.
- R more comfortable around other kids with disabilities.
- R made friends with A. They eat lunch together. A helps R set goals. A sets appropriate goals.

Skill/Functional Outcomes:
- D improving on use of communication pictures - pointing better - extra practice is good.

- R is reading better and trying harder to sound out words.
- D knows grocery list better. He is finding pictures from v.c.

(E) The student was highly motivated to attend the class and was disappointed on days he couldn't go.

(F) Positive - better self concept - happier with other friends, better scheduling and meeting of time commitments, more responsible for self and degree of participation.

(M) How to act like regular students.

6. HAVE THERE BEEN ANY EFFECTS OR CHANGES THAT OCCURRED BEYOND CLASS TIME?

(A) Meeting in building, social greetings, lunch tables.

(B) No additional info.

(C)
- R and A eat lunch and have become friends.
- Social greetings after class, in hallways, or way to bus.
- D - kids learned that if they say "Hi" first to D, he won't say it - so they waited. (control)
- Teacher changes: special education T knows more kids and have something to say "Hi" about.

(D) NH kids saying "hi" and having conversations with the kids in the hallway. "Asking if they were going to be in PE class," etc.

(E)
1. Many of the students say "Hi" to the student in the halls and cafeteria.
2. Students have asked to volunteer to help in the classroom.
3. Students ask questions to staff about our students (increased awareness).

(F) Yes, students have developed friendships that were observed in the lunch room (sitting with friends) and after school events such as skiing and dancing.

(G) They have made some friends that they talk to at lunch or at school dance.

7. WHAT RECOMMENDATIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR EXPANDING INTEGRATION EFFORTS TO INCLUDE MORE LEARNERS AND FACULTY SO THAT INTEGRATION BECOMES A GREATER FOCUS FOR THE WHOLE SCHOOL?

(A) Depends on learner. Regular education teacher interest, willingness.

(B)
- Talk to regular education T so understand philosophies and can share same expectations.
- Talk to classmates - tell why special education S in class, what to expect. Provide as much information as possible, ways for peers to help. This year didn't do anything before started. Now, would definitely prepare. I now feel confident enough to do this.

(C)
- Would like to
- Music teacher willing. Maybe chorus for N.
- I met the chorus T during the first day of school at orientation breakfast.

• Meeting places: Lounge, orientation breakfast, personal contacts - many people are willing but don't force.
• Get information out about this year.
• Use regular education T already worked
• Curriculum meetings/department meetings.
• Share within own department.

(D) "Keep at it." Be supportive to the Regular Education people, try adaptations or modifications as needed.

(E) 1. use teachers who participated this year as facilitators to introduce other perspective teachers to the process.
2. Special Education teacher needs to develop an understanding of the regular education curriculum to plan effective adaptations.
3. Inservice needs to be provided to regular education staff to provide them with strategies for working with the severely disabled learner.
4. Special education staff needs to become more aware of the "middle school" concept of education as is to further integrate special education students into the curriculum.

(F) Perhaps special education instructors who hold elementary/secondary teaching certificates could team teach a period and subject with regular education instructors and provide for more students to be integrated.

(G) Need more interest involvement from regular staff.

8. IF YOU WERE ASKED TO TALK WITH OTHER SCHOOLS INITIATING THE MOVEMENT TOWARD INTEGRATING LEARNERS WITH SEVERE DISABILITIES INTO REGULAR CLASSES, WHAT WOULD YOU TELL THEM? HOW WOULD YOU RECOMMEND THAT THEY PROCEED?

(A) Similarities: pro's that come from a "school is a community."

(B) • Must see it. Must be helped to see it and appreciate changes over time. One shot vision may not do it. Can;'t see just one day.
• Must let IEP team (those who know the kids best) make decisions about integration and which classes. Parents - 90%, Special Education Teacher 80%. Administrators cannot make decisions for individual S.
• Permanency is essential. We had to start over this year because we are in a new school. If back at last year's school, much, much more involvement in regular classes. Must build relationship and reliability.

(D) Have to have "in house" person to setup.

(E) 1. Every one belongs in an integrated school environment (mission/goals statement).
2. Start with an integration committee made up of administration, regular education staff, special education staff, university advisors and parents who will develop objectives and plan for involvement of all (2-3 year plan).
3. Provide inservice to regular education staff and students.
4. Start with interested teachers (volunteers) who can facilitate the involvement of the entire staff. Committee will meet throughout the year to examine the plan and objective make revisions (update), set future goals.

(F) It does take time to plan and organize set up the purpose and goals for the students involved. However, participation and acceptance seems to come naturally - after a week in the class our students were just one of the class. We observed more self confidence and personal responsibility in our students for getting needed materials, being on time, responding to greetings, etc.

9. HOW WOULD YOU JUSTIFY CONTINUATION OF REGULAR CLASS INVOLVEMENT TO ADMINISTRATORS, PARENTS, COLLEAGUES, COMMUNITY MEMBERS?

(A) Using the IEP on a variety of environments integration being one. How students benefit from peers and expand on that.

(B) Regular Education peers are future decision-makers, neighbors, mayors, etc. Special Education S are no different from other minorities - they are different from the "norm." After integration, similarities are more apparent.

(C) For regular education peers - important to deal with differences on day to day basis. All people will have to deal with some situation. In the future, general community will be more accepting. If careful about regular classes selected, can be as functional for special education as regular education kids.

(F) Participating in a regular education classroom was a great and normal setting for our students to learn self discipline, responsibility for self and materials, scheduling of the class and the time commitment to be there. The other students benefitted from the experience of working and participating with and being a friend to our students. This was great for everyone involved and a natural environment with natural consequences of acceptance of responsibility for self.

(G) Behavior students show they can handle these situations if given the opportunity.

APPENDIX D:

Classmates Response Summaries

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

8th GRADE SCIENCE

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR J AND J TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR SCIENCE CLASS? YES OR NO?

   Yes. (17)

   No.

   Yes, because they need to be with normal people.

   Maybe J but not too many classes, but not J, he is too loud.

   Yes, but I don't think they should do all the assignments we do.

   Yes, because they give the class the type place where you want to help them and learn with them.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN J AND J HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE THEY STARTED ATTENDING YOUR SCIENCE CLASS?

   They both seem to have more friends.

   J: He has come out and talked to people in the class.

   More fun.

   Knows new surroundings.

   Nothing.

   Talks more that he did when he first started the class.

   He talks more.

   Talks a little in class.

   Has made more friends and partially participates during class discussions.

   Knows a lot more.

   To be more open, developed a few friends (not as shy).

   More social, better worker.

   He talks a little more and pays better attention.

   Less shy, trying to do work.

   Doesn't disturb class.

   He's not as much wild as he was before.

   More responsible.

   J has seemed to have learned a lot more when he got in here than when he first.

Has gotten rowdier by sitting with G and P. He swears a lot and hits people. Has learned a lot though.

J is more outgoing then he was at the beginning.

He has learned to sort of understand what's going on in the class.

He seems to be more interested.

He has tried to answer more, he has quieted down.

J: J learned and likes to shut off the lights or close the door when asked.

More fun.

Nothing.

Not sure.

Answers questions Mr. B asks.

Has learned how it's been to be with a regular class and also to run our lights in every movie.

Knows a lot more.

Doesn't have as many outbursts as he did in the beginning.

Learned how to turn on and off lights and open and close doors.

He talks better and a little less and can open doors, turn off lights, etc.

Less, shy, grown up more (not screaming or anything).

He doesn't say "Momma" or "Dadda" lately.

Same.

Recognition.

Same with J, if you ask him a questions he will respond.

Has calmed down a lot since the beginning. He doesn't screw around. learned a lot.

J has learned to quiet down a little and he is much more easy to work with than J.

He has learned to sort of understand what's going on in the class.

He isn't really yelling mama anymore that much, he listens well.

He is always participating, also has quieted down.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING J AND J IN YOUR SCIENCE CLASS?

That they are normal human beings.

J and J are helpful.

Nothing. (2)

No, in fact it has taken away from my learning experiences. My grades have gone down.

They can learn things.

People like them can learn.

I learned to deal with their disabilities without treating them totally different.

How to deal and help the mentally handicapped.

That retarded people can cope with regular people.

That we can cope with people like that if we try.

Handicapped kids can be fun.

To be more comfortable around people like J and J.

That all special ed kids are not all alike.

How to relate to retarded children and how to respect them.
To respect and how to treat retarded students and I have also learned how lucky and fortunate we really are.

That even though they're handicapped they can get along in a regular class.

All disabled kids aren't capable of learning.

Everyone has the right to learn.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT J AND J COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

OTHER CLASSES: Art, home ec., gym.
Yes.
Social studies.
Art. (2)
All.
Math, english.
Math. (3)
Reading, art.
Home ec., gym.
Gym.

IN-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:	Gym class
	Science
	Yes.
	Most all.
	All.
	Possibly phy. ed.
	Lunch.
	Dancing.
	May be the talent show.
	None that I can think of.
AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:	Anything they want.
	Jogging.
	Gym. (2)
	In different kinds of clubs.
	All.
	Floor hockey.
	None that I can think of.
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:	Anything they want.
	All. (2)
	Clubs, groups.
	None that I can think of.

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

9th GRADE READING

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR R AND D TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR READING CLASS? YES OR NO?

Yes. When I first started working with them it was hard but lately I have and they have learned a lot about each other.

Yes, but not all of the classes because they don't seem to be able to concentrate on some subjects (be too conducing).

Yes, in reading, math, english, social studies. No in science, too much valuable equipment.

Yes. Not very many in a class with a helper.

Yes and no because if they don't learn anything then it doesn't do them good either. It depends what the class is.

Yes. They don't bother anyone, but they might not be good in other classes.

Yes. Then you can see how nice they are.

Yes. They are learning from us.

Yes, because they are learning.

Yes. I could care less. They are just like any other person.

Yes, because they need to learn some time and when they are young it is easier.

No, because they should have specialist teaching at their level.

Yes, because they can learn better in class society.

Yes, because it's good for them to see what other kids can do and then they will try to copy them.

Yes, I think they should learn that this is the way life is.

Yes, it doesn't matter to me! It is probably good for them because they get to be with other kids than like them.

No, because they need special help.

No, because they are fine the first little while but they start to get on my nerves after awhile so then it bugs me. But I just ignore them when they get to me.

No, they should have special people work with them.

Yes, as long as they do good... well you know what I mean.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN R AND D HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE THEY STARTED ATTENDING YOUR READING CLASS?

R: She is more attentive then she used to be.

More mature than when she first came into the room.

None.

Talks more.

R doesn't want to work anymore and doesn't want to work with the students anymore.

Being more familiar with the class.

She doesn't work with certain people.

Made more friends.

She is setting goals and going far beyond them.

None.

She has gotten more involved in her work.

Since she has gotten to know the class. She knows who is strict and who isn't so she won't work for some people.

She's become less shy and more stuck up.

She talks to more girls in the class.

More talkative.

I haven't noticed any except her reading ability.

She's quiet.

She's getting better at reading.

D: I can understand him really good. He's improved a lot.

Listens better than most people.

Listens better.

He is learning things and will probably learn more later.

Settled down.

Getting better at pointing to the right pictures.

Quieter during class.

Pays more attention.

He is making good progress, he tries hard.

He's become more happy.

He doesn't laugh as much.

None.

I don't know, I haven't worked with D for awhile.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING R AND D IN YOUR READING CLASS?

Patience. I've learned to be really calm and understanding with R and D.

Nothing.

People think they are something, but it's not what it seems.

They are just like anyone else.

A person can learn what they feel like.

What it's like to be like R and D.

It's not easy for them.

Nothing I didn't already know about.

Not all kids are what they seem on the outside, example: someone may be a jerk normally, but when put in important situations they are real cool.

I learned that something as common as reading class can be a joy for them.

They can't help that they do them rude things, it just happens. They aren't that dumb.

How to act around them, it's easy to do.

Nothing I didn't already know.

To respect others.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT R AND D COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

OTHER CLASSES:
Science, phy. ed., social studies, gym.
Reading, math, english.
Band maybe, gym class maybe.
Some classes they might not be good in.
Math, english.
Social studies.
None.
Science.
Music.

IN-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:	Gym. Chorus or band. Talent shows. Socializing. Gym. Computer games. I think they should run track. Dancing.
AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:	Soccer, floor hockey. Sports, clubs. Socialize.
COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:	Cub scouts, girl scouts. Tree planting. Field trips to Twins games, Valleyfair, etc.

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

9th GRADE INDUSTRIAL TECH.

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR C TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR INDUSTRIAL TECH CLASS? YES OR NO?

   Yes. (5)

   Yes, it's ok with me.

   Yes, because it is probably better for him to be with to other people.

   Yes. I think it's a good experience for both of us.

   Yes. It's a great learning experience for him. Depending on how he feels. No one ever asks him how he feels why don't you all ask him how he feels instead of treating him like a pet (dog).

   Yes. He should get involved with other people so he knows how we act and how he should act.

   No.

   Yes, but more than special needs student in each class room.

   Yes, so he can learn.

   Yes, because it is a good idea to learn.

   Yes. I don't care because I keep to myself. Don't ask us, ask him.

   Yes. He seems to be getting something out of class.

   No. Only some of the classes.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN C HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE HE STARTED ATTENDING YOUR INDUSTRIAL TECH CLASS?

   More active than earlier.

   None, I have not really noticed.

Learning to work with others.

I can't think of any.

He's more active.

I haven't really noticed any difference in C because most of the work is done by his watcher.

He looks bored if you ask me.

None, I haven't watched him a lot.

Don't make no funny noises any more.

Don't hear no funny noises coming from his mouth no more.

Learning more and liking it.

I really haven't noticed.

He has been around the machines more.

I haven't noticed.

Nothing.

I really haven't checked.

More active than earlier this year.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING C YOUR INDUSTRIAL TECH CLASS?

No, not really.

That with some help he can do a lot more than I thought he could.

He can learn and be involved like any student.

That people like him are capable of doing work.

The disability doesn't make him an invalid.

I haven't learned anything, because C never really gets involved.

Nothing.

That people like him can do the work.

He is a nice kid.

I don't talk to C much but I like his instructor.

That he's not all handicapped.

I've learned that it is good for us and him to have him around.

That people like him, he can really do the work.

That people of his disabilities can do as much as we can.

Nothing.

Not much.

Nothing. (I haven't worked with him.)

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT C COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

No, not at the moment.

I cannot think of any offhand.

OTHER CLASSES:
Art, gym.
Industrial Tech in general.
Science.
Gym.
Art, printing.
Yes, (some of them).

IN-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:
Don't know.
Wheel chair contests, who can count the farthest.
Concerts.
Any subject.
Yes.

AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:
Yes, sports.
Football.
Concerts.
Band.
Yes.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:
Yes, whatever they do.
Walk kids home.
Parades.
Anything he wants.
Yes.

Do not treat him like your pet (give him a chance).

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

7th GRADE PHYSICAL EDUCATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR J TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS? YES OR NO?

Yes. So she don't feel like she's any different than the other kids.
Yes. It gives her a chance to be with other kids and socialize, and see what gym class is like.
Yes. Because she's with other kids and she doesn't feel isolated from the school.
Yes. Because she learns just like us and it will make her feel like she wants to.
Yes. So she don't fell like she's different. Because she's not.
Yes. So she can learn. Because she is a person, too and should be well physical.
Yes, Because she has the right to enjoy everything that other kids get the privilege. She can learn how other kids her age act.
Yes. Because it makes her feel like one of us.
Yes. I think it's good for her because she can join in with other people and make new friends.
Yes. Because she could get acquainted with us and could try out different things.
Yes, it gives her a sense of being like everyone else.
Yes. Because she's just a regular person with a few differences.
Yes. They are not stupid, you know.
Yes, so she can get a better education and better exercise.
Yes, yes I do think it would be a good idea to mix with other people.
Yes. (3)
Yes. Gets her to be active more students.
Yes, because she is more active.
Yes, because nobody else will let her.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN J HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE THEY STARTED ATTENDING YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS?

She talks more. She does more things. She's becoming to know how to act around people.
She started talking to us more and doing more activities that we do.
She talks more and participates more in class.
She isn't as shy as she used to be. She enjoys it more it seems.
She talks to me outside of class and I think she feels better about herself.
She learned to be open more with us. She learned how to act around other people.
She's starting to talk to us more and she joins in more activities than at first.
She talks more and she is more outgoing and she does everything we do.
She is not as shy around us as she used to be. She's excellent at basketball and tennis.
She's talking more, getting more acquainted.
It seems more like she's feels included.
She tries things.
Talking more, participating.
She seems more active and not as shy.
She is talking with others, and taking part in other activities in gym.
She seems happier. (2)

She seems happier and is getting more coordinated.
More active with the kids around her.
She is not as shy.
She has smiled more.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING J IN YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS?

How important it is for people to treat people the same and not make fun of them. Just because they have a problem.
People like her can participate in things just like I can.
She's just as normal as any one of us and she can do anything she wants to.
She can do just as much as we can and she can do things as well as some of us if not better.
How to talk and be friends with the 916 kids.
That she can do almost anything that everybody does or even more than.
Kids may have a learning disability but she tries and she don't give up.
She's really a nice person.
I have learned that kids with disabilities can participate in just about the same activities as other kids.
That she can participate in our classes.
Handicapped people can do many of the same things we can.
That even retarded kids are normal.
They aren't helpless.
That people who have disabilities need physical education, too.
To take time to help them because they too can learn but just a little slower.
I have learned that she is just like the rest of us, she really isn't much different.
She's just like everybody else.
She's just like all the other kids in the class.
Most people are the same.
That she has a good sense of humor.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT J COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

OTHER CLASSES:

Math, art, english, geography, everything, homeroom.
All of the classes. (2)
Math, art, english, any others - all.
Art, home ec, math, anything, homeroom.
Homeroom with reading, english, geography, and all 1-6 hours.
In all the 1-6 hours of the day.
Math.
English, math, social, science.
Math, geography, english, science.
Home ec or shop.
Health, art, music, english.
Art, anything.
Home economics.
Home ec. Teach her how to take care of herself. Math. To teach her how to do the basics in life.
Any. (5)
Math, english, and art.

IN-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:

Talent show, plays, homeroom, president and representative.
Almost anything.
Field trips.
Field trips - all of them.
Talent show, choir, homeroom, president and representative.
All anything that everybody else can do.
The assemblies, anything.
Talent show. (2)
Talent show, plays.
Programs.
?
Anything.
Programs. (2)
Student council. (3)
Any.
School capsule.

AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES:

Sports, clubs. (2)
Some sports.
All of them - newspaper, sports, clubs.
Sports and clubs. (3)
All track, tennis, softball, etc.
Dances, sports.
Tennis, basketball.
Basketball, volleyball.
Parties.
Sports, programs, plays.
Anything.
Dances.
Teach team, to get physically fit.
Sports, if likes.
Any.
After school swimming.

COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES:

Anything she can or wants to do.
Go out (like for pizza or something).
Go shopping or lunch or something like that.
All of them - go out for pizza, shopping, bowling.
Anything she wants.
Anything that she enjoys doing.
Any of them.
Go to the mall, out to eat.
Go to mall.
Art classes, sports.
Swimming.
Anything.
Softball or a kind of sport.
Church programs to help believe in something.
Sports. (3)
Volunteer work or something like that.
Any.

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

8th GRADE PHYSICAL EDUCATION

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR J TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS? YES OR NO?

Yes, she has done good.
Yes. (9)
Maybe. (2)
Gym class yes, but other classes might be difficult for her. Then the teacher would pay more attention to her then we might not learn as much.
No, it might be too difficult work.
Yes, because she should do stuff with others.
Yes, doing stuff with others.
Yes, I think it's really good for her.
Yes, I do. I think its good for all of us because we can learn from each other.
Yes, because it teaches her more stuff.
No.
Yes, she's good at.
Personally, I didn't care.
She probably dreads going to our class.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN J HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE SHE STARTED ATTENDING YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS?

She has been getting very good at what we were doing.
She has become better at things.
Less shy. (2)
She's doing better with other people.
More social.
She's more able to do more things. (2)
She's able to do more things in class.
I haven't noticed any. (4)
I don't really know J very well. I've been her partner before but I suppose that's about it.
None. (4)
She has more friends.
She was happier.
Don't notice her.
Not much.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING J IN YOUR PHYSICAL EDUCATION CLASS?

Not much, but she has done a good job.
Not much.
Some kids from 916 can be in regular classes.
Didn't stay by her.
Nothing. (7)
I haven't really watched her that much.
Haven't really watched much.
That people with disabilities can do lots of things.
That even people with physical problems can do some of the same things I can.
That she knows how to do a lot of stuff that we know how to do.
More patient.
No.
She can get along with others.
You got to be more patient.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT J COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

No. (2)
Yes.
None.
No comment.

Other classes:
Home ec, industrial tech., arts, computer.
Home ec.
Industrial tech, art.
Some.
Art. (5)
Maybe art. It wouldn't be that hard.
Art, not so hard.
After school, newspaper, yearbook.
No, if she's not good in them.
No. (2)
Home ec and classes like that - music.
Health.
Home ec, health, art and music.

In-school activities:
Plays, student council, dances.
Art. (2)
Some, industrial tech., art.
Art, might get made fun of. (2)
Yes. (3)
No.
In-school.
Art, industrial tech.
Don't know. (1)

After-school activities:	Sports programs, yearbook club. Tennis. Computer, sports. Softball. Gym activities and computer. Plays, she might get made fun of though. (2) Plays and sports, she might get made fun of. Yes. (3) No. Don't know. (3) Sports. Physical ed.
Community activities:	Helping around. On the tennis team Yes. Yes, if she is capable. No. (2) Don't know. (3) Sports.

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

7th GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR J AND G TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS? YES OR NO?

   Yes. (25)
   No. (2)
   Yes, because it's good for them to be with us.
   I don't care.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN J AND G HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE THEY STARTED ATTENDING YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS?

   J: She asks questions and says she did her homework.
   None. (2)
   She started to listen instead of talking while the teacher was.
   Enjoys herself more. Knows more about how we work in school.
   She raises her hand when she wants to say something.
   More sociable.
   She enjoys the films.
   None. I don't really see them much.
   She asks a lot of questions.
   She is more talkative.
   She can communicate better.
   Talkative.
   That she thinks she could go smacking people in the face.
   I haven't noticed any changes. I really don't pay any attention to them and I don't know how they acted before.
   They have quieted down since we have been having movies.
   I do not know.
   I can't really say because they weren't here for long enough.
   Doesn't talk out of turn as much.
   They pay attention.
   They pay more attention.
   Haven't really been looking.
   More quiet.
   Nice.
   She seems to be more happy and won't be as shy.
   Learned to socialize more.
   I don't know.

G: Know people's names.
Paid more attention.
She is friendlier.
There wasn't that much of a change.
Enjoys herself more. Knows more about how we work in school.
More sociable.
She likes and wants to do our social studies work.
None. I don't see her much.
Knows more people.
She is about the same as J.
Listens more and asks a lot of questions.
Want to do the work.
I haven't noticed any changes. I really don't pay any attention to them and I don't know how they acted before.
They have quieted down since we have been having movies.
I do not know.
I can't really say because they weren't here for long enough.
Doesn't talk out of turn as much.
?
They pay more attention.
None.
Haven't really been looking.
Talks more with other kids.
Friendly.
She likes to ask questions on what we are doing.
Learned to socialize more.
I don't know.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING J AND G IN YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS?

Nothing really.
They are friendly.
No. (2)
That people like them aren't always no fun.
That people with disabilities are capable of learning.
I've been able to experience what it's like to be around people with disabilities.
I don't mind at all, I think it's good for them to be with more people and also it's fun to talk and do activities with them.
They can do what we can do, almost.
I have learned that they are people, too.
They are just like other people.
They are real kids.
Well, now I feel more comfortable around them.
A lot.
I don't think is a good idea having them in my social class.
?
That they can handle it and should be in more classes.
I've learned how the disabled kids act.
How to be nice to them and communicate.
That I can get along with the 916 students.
That they can be in classes with regular students.

They can work together like us, too.
They're no different.
That they can learn, too.
That they're not as bad as some people think they are.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT J AND G COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

Other classes:

Y
Science, you see a lot of movies in it.
Science.
All classes.
Home ec (cooking days).
Any classes, home ec would be fun.
English, home room.
Gym.
English, science.
English. (2)
Art, health.
None.
Shop.
Art, home ec, shop, gym.
Art. (3)
Health, science.
Computer.
Math, English, art.
Home ec or shop.

In-school activities:

Y
Gym, sports.
No.
Student council. (6)
Gym.
Parties.
Choir.
None.
Don't know.
?
Counseling.
Home ec or shop.
Programs.

After-school activities:

Y
Sports. (2)
No.
Any sport.
Any.
Soccer. (2)
Gym things.
Baseball.
Capsule.
None.
Softball.
Don't know.
?
Swimming.
Aerobics.

Community activities:

Y
No.
Don't know. (2)
Sports.
Litter pickups.
Any.
Movies.
Bingo. (2)
None.
?

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

7th GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR K TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS? YES OR NO?

   Yes. (24)
   Yes. When we do work sheets I think he may get bored.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN K HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE HE STARTED ATTENDING YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS?

   He does not get excited too much any more.
   I have only seen him once.
   He's quieter than before.
   He's probably fun to be with because he might talk about what he did or what he saw on a movie.
   He doesn't want a.
   He doesn't raise his hand when he doesn't know the answer as often as he used to.
   He doesn't yell things out so often.
   At beginning he talked out loud, now he raises his hand.
   He doesn't make any noises when the teacher is talking.
   That he has learned how to act in our class (with different people).
   Whenever Mr. P asks a question, K raises his hands to try to answer the question.
   Stopped hugging.
   He kind of quit asking for hugs.
   I've noticed that he knows how to behave better around us.
   He doesn't speak out unless he raises his hand.
   He seems calmer, more quiet.
   Not much because he hasn't been in here much but he kind of is learning when to raise his hand when Mr. P asks a question.
   He learned to wait his turn and not to talk out of turn.
   He wasn't as shy as in the beginning.
   He seems to have calmed down and not wanting to hug everyone.
   He learned to raise his hand.
   None. (2)
   Nothing.
   He's not always trying to hug people.

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING K IN YOUR SOCIAL STUDIES CLASS?

How mentally retarded kids act in a big group, and in different situations.
That mentally retarded kids are just like us.
They are just like us except in a different way.
The way he acts around other children.
I learned that it is hard to understand what goes on when your disabled.
That the 916 kids are a lot of fun.
That anybody has the right to join in a group with anybody they want.
That he's just like us, he learns just like us. It would be nice if he could be in other classes.
A lot.
That it is kind of hard to teach someone in his condition.
I've learned how to act around him.
They aren't that much different from the rest of us.
That he can't always be quiet, he sometimes lets out a yelp!
That he might not understand us, but he learned how to behave in class.
That he can participate in class with a little help.
Not very much because I'm used to having a handicapped person living with me. My brother is down-syndrome.
How to treat K.
More about disabled kids.
How he acts.
Nothing.
I have learned a lot by watching him.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT K COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

Yes.
No. (2)

Other classes:
Art. (5)
Science. (2)
Health. (2)
Art, maybe gym.
English, maybe.
Art, music and phy ed.
Gym. (2)
English, so he can learn to read. Math so he knows how to count. All of the subjects we have.
Reading.
Music class.
Almost all.
English.
Math, English, home ec.

In-school activities:
Paint.
Lunch.
Assemblies.
Art, music, computers, swimming.
Shop.
Computer (if someone is helping them).

?
Phy ed, go to parties, goal days, and any special events.
Health.
Computers.
Talent show.
Almost all.
Gym.
Lunch.
Basketball.

After-school activities:

Just run and play.
Sports.
Dances.
Computers.
?
Join the things he wants to join just for his pleasure.
Golf.
Exercise, gym.
Track.
Baseball. (2)
Softball.

Community activities:

Special baseball.
Just about any activities that involve the community.
T-ball or softball.
Go to the parks, free to be himself.
Swim.
?
Movies, going to a fast food place.
Parades, etc.
Soccer.
Softball.

FEEDBACK FROM STUDENTS ABOUT REGULAR CLASS INTEGRATION:

6th GRADE HEALTH CLASS

LRE Project
May 1988

1. DO YOU THINK IT'S GOOD FOR E, B, AND N TO ATTEND REGULAR CLASSES, LIKE YOUR HEALTH CLASS? YES OR NO?

Yes, because they would learn things just like normal kids.
Yes. I think that it is a good opportunity for me to get to know them.
Yes. (12)
Yes, because they can have friends and learn to like people.
Yes, because they can learn the stuff we learn.
Yes, because they have to learn, too and I don't care, because I think they're no different than me.
Yes, then they can know what it's like to be with other people in other classes.
Yes, it is good to fit in with all the other kids, so they can later work independently.
Yes, because they can sort of learn how to act in classes, how they're behavior should be.
Yes, so they can become so they are not any different.
Yes and no. I sit by E and he is fun to be around, but when your taking a test you can't stand all the questions.
Yes, because they will learn more and meet more people.
Yes, because they learn more and we learn more about them.

2. WHAT CHANGES IN E, B, AND N HAVE YOU NOTICED SINCE THEY STARTED ATTENDING YOUR HEALTH CLASS?

They are fun to be with and they are funny.
I think they've all become more open and talk more. Take part in more things.

E: Same thing as B. Socialize more.
Learned to cooperate with other students.
Seems more independent.
He's more quiet than at the beginning of the year.
Is learning how to cooperate better with other people.
He has been a lot more talkative and friendly.
He is paying more attention, and he gets along with others better.
He got to have more friends. He liked to be with us.
They both became more self-confident and became more open.
Gets more friends.
He works more and better.
Less shy.
More calm. He's talking without his stutter often. Isn't as perplexed as much.
Can listen better, understands conversations.
Is becoming more independent.
He's learned more.
Not asking other people how to do things.
He talks more.
None.
Listen to the teacher.
Draws real good.

B: Been learning more new things. Socialize more.
Has gotten more creative.
He made new friends.
He's getting new styles and gets along better with people.
He isn't as loud, he's made a lot of new friends.
I used to go to B's house and play with him.
He got to have more friends, too. He talked more than before.
They both became more self-confident and became more open.
Gets more friends.
He works more and better.
Interacts better.
I don't know.
Can do things on his own, been more capable.
Is spontaneous.
He talks more.
He is being nicer.
None.
Listen to the teacher.
He talks more then he used to.

N: Same as B. Not being too shy.
I don't know her very well.
It's hard to tell cause she has only been here for a little while.
I don't know. She hasn't been here a long time.
She is more talkative.
She has talked more to others, and likes to learn.
She got to have more friends. Go to know more people. Started to talk more. Started laughing.
Is smarter.
She gets along with everybody and will talk to people.
She hasn't been in our class for a long time so there's no changes!
About the same.
I don't know.
Can be taught by student, a good reader.
She meets more people.
She is talking more.
None.
Listen to the teacher. Works good.
She listens really good.
? (2)

3. WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED BY HAVING E, B, AND N IN YOUR HEALTH CLASS?

How 916 kids are. How they act. To see how they could cooperate. To see how they feel.
That they are decent people.
That 916 kids aren't bad.
They're just like other people.
That they are normal people.
That they are not different than we are. They are human just like you, me and us.
That they aren't any different from us. That they're fun to be with.
That just because someone may look different doesn't mean there not just as smart as other people.
That some people need help and encouragement to do well.
To be more absorbent.
That they are able to kind of tell what we are talking about in health.
I get to hear what they have to say about things I think.
They are normal people, too.
They are people and have feelings.
They can be capable in learning something new.
That people can learn very fast.
That people learn from watching other people.
How to help them.
To treat disabled people the same way and they're also like me and you.
Not a thing.
That people with problems still are people, I mean they can do the same thing we can do.
That there just like us.

4. CAN YOU THINK OF OTHER CLASSES, OR AFTER SCHOOL ACTIVITIES, OR DURING SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT E, B, AND N COULD BE MORE INVOLVED IN?

Computers that will be funner.

Other classes:
Gym, art, and music. Reading, too.
Science.
Spelling, gym.
Social Studies.
Art. (3)
Art, gym.
Science, art. (2)
1 hour more day.
Science, art.
Gym.
Reading.
Art or music.
Science, language, spelling.
Reading, spelling, art, music.

In-school activities:
Art and music. Reading, too.
Don't know. (2)
Student council. (2)
Gym. (3)
Games.
No.

After-school activities:	Swimming, T-ball or other sports.
	Computer.
	Newspaper.
	Sports.
	Softball.
	Basketball.
	Intramural softball.
	Swimming, softball.
	Gym, softball.
	Soccer, basketball, softball.
Community activities:	Go shopping. See new things.
	Bowling at Saxon or Maplewood.
	They could go to church.
	Bowling team.
	Don't know.
	A ball game or movie.
	Bowling.
	No.